

NLWJC - KAGAN

STAFF & OFFICE - D.C. CIRCUIT

BOX 007 - FOLDER 005 DC

Elena Kagan News 2 [2]

FOIA MARKER

This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records

Subgroup/Office of Origin: Counsel Office

Series/Staff Member: Sarah Wilson

Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 14686

FolderID:

Folder Title:
Elena Kagan News 2 [2]

Stack:

V

Row:

13

Section:

2

Shelf:

11

Position:

1

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

together and to practicing hard and coming back next year and seeing if they could win at some of those games and beat some of those teams they lost to during the year just completed.

BOWLES: I think it's fair to say that we did have a good year this year. It was a year of progress and achievement. It's also been a year of true bipartisanship and cooperation. And it's a year in which many of us banded together to prepare our country for the 21st century.

I know inevitably (ph) you want to talk about the hits and misses that occur during the last week. And I promise you, we'll get to those and I'll take those questions.

But let me talk about, briefly, some of the things we have accomplished during the last year.

Back in February, the president laid out a clear, ambitious call to action in his State of the Union address for the second term.

*** Elapsed Time 00:05, Eastern Time 14:50 ***

And as the Congress is now adjourning, I think the record is clear that we have accomplished a great deal. I would begin with the accomplishment of achievement of the first bipartisan balanced budget in a generation that will produce real savings in excess of \$900 million.

That budget was achieved with some real tax cuts for hard-working, middle class families, at the times when they need it the most, when they are raising their kids, to pay for education, when they are buying or selling a home and saving for retirement.

We also achieved the largest increase in education funding in 30 years.

*** Elapsed Time 00:06, Eastern Time 14:51 ***

We did this by vastly increasing the money that's being made available for early childhood programs to prepare our kids so that they are ready to enter school, ready to learn, and also through the expansion of the America Reads program and the establishment of high national standards for fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math, so that when our kids graduate from high school, they'll graduate with a diploma that means something.

BOWLES: And also with the availability now of increased Pell grants and with the tuition tax credit and with the Hope scholarships, that additional two years of education will be universally available, which is a goal the president outlined in the State of the Union.

We also came forward this year with the largest increase in health care for children since Medicaid in 1965, making it possible for as many as 5 million additional kids to have health care insurance -- kids that don't have insurance today -- through an unprecedented \$24 billion for children's health care.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

We also were able to get forward and pass some critical long-term entitlement reform by taking out and extracting about \$400 to \$450 billion worth of savings in the Medicare program that extends the life of the Medicare trust fund out for 10 years.

*** Elapsed Time 00:07, Eastern Time 14:52 ***

And we also established a Medicare commission, which will allow us to address the long-term structural problems associated with Medicare.

Six, we were able to pass provisions that will enable us to move 2 million people from welfare to work, and also to restore basic health and disability benefits to legal law-abiding immigrants -- something that the president had promised to do prior to the beginning of this year.

We also took concrete steps forward to preserve the environment, to clean up over 500 toxic waste dumps, and with our Brownfields tax initiatives, to redevelop 14,000 contaminated sites within our inner cities.

We also were able to get through ozone and particulate matter regulations, which will go a long ways toward improving the health of our children. And the U.S. came out with a very strong position on global climate change.

On the foreign policy front, I think we also have a great deal that we can be proud of.

*** Elapsed Time 00:08, Eastern Time 14:53 ***

We did ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention. We were able to extend normal trading relations with China.

BOWLES: We strengthened the NATO Partnership for Peace through the signing of a NATO-Russia Founding Act, and by offering membership in NATO to Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary. We also negotiated the information technology agreement and the telecommunications agreement, unshackling over \$500 billion in trade in sectors where the U.S. already has a very dominant position, and we launched the Africa Free Trade Initiative.

There are also several areas where we did come up short. While we accomplished a great deal, there were four basic areas that we did not reach the potential that we had hoped to. The first was clearly in the renewal of fast-track trading authority. We did have strong opposition by some members of the Democratic party, and we also had opposition from some members of the Republican party who linked their trade vote to international family planning.

*** Elapsed Time 00:09, Eastern Time 14:54 ***

We have had a temporary setback there. We do plan to come back next year, hopefully in February, with a bill that can achieve broader bipartisan support. This is something that the president truly believes is critical to the future economic well being of this country.

A second area where we feel short was in the passage of real campaign finance reform. The Republican Congressional leaders blocked the McCain-Feingold bill

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

from coming to a vote. Thank goodness, Senator Tom Daschle, the minority leader, was able to extract a pledge from Trent Lott to have a clean up-or-down vote on this measure before March 6th of 1998. So this is another portion of where fell short that we'll be able to fight the battle again at the beginning of next year.

Third, we did not, we were not able to enact a strong juvenile justice bill, which we had hoped to do this year.

*** Elapsed Time 00:10, Eastern Time 14:55 ***

However, the president was able to use his executive power to make some progress on this central piece of legislation.

BOWLES: And many of you may remember that we were able to issue a directive to all federal agencies requiring child safety locks to be issued with every handgun, and we also reached an agreement with eight major handgun manufacturers to provide child safety locks with each handgun that's sold.

And lastly, just the day before yesterday, we were set back in our efforts to attain funding for the UN arrears and for the new agreements on borrowing through the IMF, again, another area where we plan to go back in early February to meet with the Congress and try to see if we can bring this to a successful conclusion.

I think that summarizes what we were able to achieve, where we felt we fell short and some of the areas where we did fall short and hope to go back on at the beginning of next year.

*** Elapsed Time 00:11, Eastern Time 14:56 ***

Sandy is now going to come up and take a...

QUESTION: What about the nominations that have -- going to set back, surgeon general and civil rights?

BOWLES: There are a number of nominations which didn't come through. Two -- you just mentioned two that we have a great concern on. We believe that Mr. Satcher will be confirmed to be the surgeon general at the early part of next year. We believe that Bill Lann Lee is highly qualified to be assistant attorney general for civil rights. He certainly has a record of clear integrity. This is a man who has spent his entire life fighting for civil rights and someone that the president supports and supports strongly. We believe this man deserves a vote, but I assure you he will be the next assistant attorney general for civil rights.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) recess (OFF-MIKE) what are you saying that the recess...

BOWLES: I assure you he will be the next assistant attorney general for civil rights.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) quantum leap and say there will be?

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

(LAUGHTER)

BOWLES: Well, we hope he'll get a vote.

QUESTION: Mr. Bowles, do you believe that Congress is playing by the rules with all of these appointments?

*** Elapsed Time 00:12, Eastern Time 14:57 ***

BOWLES: Well, I think, you know, yes, they're playing by their own rules. Whether or not we like those rules is another subject.

BOWLES: I think the job they've done with Bill Lann Lee is disgraceful. I am deeply disappointed with their effort as it relates to appointing judges.

As you know, I've spent my entire life trying to bring people together. I think I'm known as a relatively reasonable person when working with both sides.

But I think the job they've done with judges and with our assistant attorney general for civil rights is just plain wrong.

QUESTION: What are you going to have to do differently, do you think, to get the fast-track passed in the spring?

BOWLES: I think we have to do a number of things. We've already started doing those. We've been reaching out to members of both sides, trying to talk about ways that we can make some modifications in our bill so that we can come forward with a bill that can get broader bipartisan support.

We just failed -- very -- you know, we were very, very close this time.

*** Elapsed Time 00:13, Eastern Time 14:58 ***

And we think we can make the kind of modifications that will allow us to come back and get it passed in February.

QUESTION: Can you tell us what the modifications might look like?

BOWLES: I'd rather spend some time talking with the members of Congress, doing our homework, being properly prepared, going out to the people and generating some additional support in the country, and then come forward a little later on and tell you exactly how we would modify the bill in order to achieve the support we need to get it passed.

But it is critical that we get it passed. As you look to the future, one third of the growth that we've had in the past has come from exports. In the future, world trade is expected to grow at three times the rate of the U.S. economy.

Ninety-six percent of the world's customers are not here. We have got to bring down these trade barriers so that we can compete on a level playing field with our competitors in Japan and Europe.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

QUESTION: Dean Smith retired. Are you planning to do the same?

(LAUGHTER)

BOWLES: What's that?

QUESTION: Dean Smith retired. Are you planning to do the same? Are you going to be here next year?

BOWLES: No (ph), I plan -- I'm going to be here as long as the president wants me to stay.

*** Elapsed Time 00:14, Eastern Time 14:59 ***

QUESTION: Erskine, the fast-track debate revealed not only some differences in principles over trade between House Democrats and the White House, but there were also a lot signs of personal resentment and tension and a lot of ill will on their part -- or feelings that they weren't appreciated here.

QUESTION: But there were also a lot of signs of personal resentment and tension and a lot of ill will on their part, of feelings that they weren't appreciated here. The larger relationship between House Democrats and the White House is what I'm talking about. How much of a concern is that to you and the president, and is there anything you plan to do about it?

BOWLES: I think some of that has been overblown, John. I think if you look at the votes that we've had this year, whether it's in the balanced budget where we had between two-thirds and three-quarters of the Democrats voting with us, if you even look at the trade issue where it passed with a majority of Democrats in the Senate, where it had the support of the majority of the governors, a majority of the mayors, if you look at our positions on education, on health care, on welfare to work, on any number of issues -- on tobacco, on some of the issues that we'll face next year, I think you can see that there is broad consensus among the Democratic party.

*** Elapsed Time 00:15, Eastern Time 15:00 ***

Only in the area of trade, I believe, is -- and I think it is a very distinct area -- has there been somewhat of a schism. And what we're going to try to do over the next couple of months is work hard to make sure we bring ourselves together so that we can have a bill that gets broader bipartisan support.

QUESTION: Why weren't you able to at least round up votes in the new Democratic Caucus? It seems of all the Democrats who should have supported free trade, you would have been able to round up all those votes.

BOWLES: Karen, I hope that we can do a better job in rounding up support for it as we go forward. We were able to get about a quarter of the Democratic Caucus to come forward and support it. We hope, if we can make some modifications to the bill, that it'll make it more acceptable to a larger number of Democrats and we can get their support.

QUESTION: Erskine, you were talking about the IMF and how you might find (OFF-MIKE) of this next year. There are some crises going (OFF-MIKE) in Asia

that might prevent you from being able to do that.

*** Elapsed Time 00:16, Eastern Time 15:01 ***

Yesterday they said, Capitol Hill estimated it will require about \$50 billion to bail out Korea if that becomes necessary.

QUESTION: Since they just cut off part of your IMF funding, will that force you to use the currency stability fund?

BOWLES: In the discussions I've had with Secretary Rubin and Deputy Secretary Summers, they feel comfortable that we can manage the problems that we now face and we expect to be able to go back in the first part of the legislative session and, hopefully, secure the funding for the IMF, and in addition get the funding that we need for the UN arrears.

Both of these should have passed this time. I think the fact that they were linked to international family planning just made no sense whatsoever.

QUESTION: Erskine, you said that you're looking to alter the bill that was out there. Are you looking, at this point, in altering a broader bill? Or might you do a -- what's the likelihood that you'd do a fast-track bill that's more narrowly tailored to a specific idea such as a treaty with Chile?

BOWLES: We haven't made a decision on that yet.

QUESTION: Erskine, the president...

*** Elapsed Time 00:17, Eastern Time 15:02 ***

QUESTION: On Bill Lann Lee, you were saying that he is going to be the next civil rights enforcer, and you say unequivocally. But are you kind of fearful -- is the White House fearful that there could be some retaliatory measures from Congress if there is a recess appointment?

BOWLES: This is a matter that the president believes in strongly. He has supported the principle of civil rights his entire career. Bill Lann Lee is somebody who is qualified, who deserves to be assistant attorney general for civil rights, who will make a great representative of this country and he should be and he will be...

QUESTION: So you're not fearful of congressional retaliation?

BOWLES: No.

QUESTION: Erskine, the president started out the year with a very strong call for bipartisanship, and prevailed through part of the year. Have you (OFF-MIKE) Bill Lann Lee -- has bipartisanship totally broken down in Congress?

BOWLES: No. And I think there's a good deal of opportunity for congressional bipartisan efforts, whether it's in the international area or whether it's on selected domestic issues.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

*** Elapsed Time 00:18, Eastern Time 15:03 ***

When we can put together a bipartisan coalition, we want to do that.

BOWLES: We think that's in the best interests of the American people. They want to see us get things done and not just talk about things. I think if you look at that laundry list of issues that I went through, whether it was achievement of some real fiscal responsibility in this country, whether it's in the area of education, whether it's in the area of environment, whether it's in the area of moving people from welfare to work, tax relief for middle class families, there was broad, bipartisan support for each one of those, and we worked hard to achieve that.

QUESTION: When your appearance was billed here, we were told that you were also going to project what the president would be seeking in the future in addition to fast-track. Are there any new initiatives?

BOWLES: I think there are a number of things that you can expect to see us working on as we go forward. First, we do want to make sure that we do open up markets for U.S. goods, so we will come back with some fast-track legislation. Secondly, we are going to work again to have some real campaign finance reform. Thirdly, we will work again to pass a strong juvenile justice bill. We do want to secure the UN arrearages and the funding for the IMF.

*** Elapsed Time 00:19, Eastern Time 15:04 ***

In the area of new things that we'll be exploring, I think you will look at us trying to advance our education agenda, stressing the importance of high national standards and the infrastructure needs that our schools face today. I think you'll see us working on a consumer bill of rights. You'll see us very active with the tobacco legislation. I think you'll see us moving forward with health care and pension portability, child care initiatives, reforming the Medicare and Social Security needs of this country and trying to solve the structural long-term areas of that.

Let me bring Sandy up, because he's got to leave in just a minute, to talk to you a little bit about foreign policy.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) the tax code?

BERGER: Did you ask me about reform of the tax code, Helen?

(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: Yes.

BERGER: We're in favor of it. Are there any questions? I have a long statement here about accomplishments in the foreign policy area, but I think you may have some questions.

*** Elapsed Time 00:20, Eastern Time 15:05 ***

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) with the president's diplomacy, is it your sense that the problem here and that what the president and the administration has to do

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

is convince everybody else in the world that Saddam is as big a threat as you apparently believe he is?

BERGER: No. I think the international community has spoken quite clearly over the last two days in first the UN Security Council resolution, then last night in the unanimous statement after he decided to throw out the American UNSCOM inspectors -- indeed, in practical effect, all the inspectors. So I think there is a clear base of understanding in the international community that this is a threat, that he has the -- certainly has demonstrated the intent to use these weapons. And if he has an unfettered capacity to do so, it's a threat not only to his neighbors, but to -- to the world. And we are now engaged in talking, consulting with our -- with our allies and friends on how we intensify the pressure on Saddam Hussein to get the same message.

*** Elapsed Time 00:21, Eastern Time 15:06 ***

QUESTION: Well, isn't there disagreement, though, on how much pressure should be exercised and whether or not it's worth going all the way?

BERGER: I think there is a clear feeling on the part of the international community that this is a threat, this is a serious matter, that this poses a risk to the region and a risk to the world. And I'm not going to speculate on where -- what steps may proceed.

QUESTION: Sandy, the military moves are fairly obvious for us to gauge. I mean, you know, they say we're moving a second carrier in. The diplomatic moves are harder for us to ascertain. Can you tell us what it is precisely that you're trying to accomplish, what the secretary of state is trying to accomplish, what the president is trying to accomplish when we call France or Russia or Great Britain or whomever?

*** Elapsed Time 00:22, Eastern Time 15:07 ***

BERGER: We are consulting with our allies on how we intensify the pressure on Saddam Hussein and what -- what should take place if he doesn't -- doesn't reverse himself.

QUESTION: Sandy, is it a concern that everything that can be done to Saddam has been done? He's lived through sanctions for 6.5 years. We've hit him repeatedly with air strikes. And none of it has done much good.

BERGER: Well, I think that's -- I'm not sure I accept that judgment. The fact is that Saddam has been kept in a box in a sense for this six-year period. The sanctions, which are the most pervasive sanctions every imposed on a nation in the history of mankind, have cost his country \$100 million -- \$100 billion.

Now every year or so, Saddam Hussein tries to break out of that containment box either by moving towards the south, as he's done in some instances, moving in the north as he's done in other instances, in this case throwing out the international inspectors.

*** Elapsed Time 00:23, Eastern Time 15:08 ***

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

And what the international community has to do is to be, once again, absolutely clear and firm that that is not acceptable behavior, that he remains a threat and the only way out for him is to come into compliance.

QUESTION: If I could follow up on that. The point of the question is there isn't much more we could do at this point.

BERGER: Well, I think that we have, as I said before, we have maintained for six years, since the end of the Gulf War, we have kept Saddam Hussein contained. We have done an enormous amount to destroy his weapons of mass destruction through UNSCOM. We have stopped him when he has tried to move again towards Kuwait. And I think we are -- we have to -- this is going to be a long-term enterprise on the part of the international community to assure that he does not, once again, become a threat to his neighbors or a threat to the region or a threat to his own people.

*** Elapsed Time 00:24, Eastern Time 15:09 ***

QUESTION: Sandy...

BERGER: John.

QUESTION: ... is it long-term U.S. policy -- not UN policy, but U.S. policy -- to see Saddam removed from power? And is there any possibility of using this current crisis to achieve some more long-term resolution so that we don't have this sort of episodic, annual round of crises?

BERGER: Well, it is American policy to assure that at the very least, he is not a threat to his neighbors or a threat to his own people. That policy has more or less been successful over the last six years.

And I think we have to be prepared when he tries, as he has in the very insidious way in this case, to break out of that box, to make it very clear that that is not something that we'll tolerate.

QUESTION: Just to follow up on John's question. Did the president intend to lose the goal post this morning when he said that the sanctions would be kept in place as long as Saddam is in power, as long as he lasts, as he put it? Is it his opinion that the sanction will not be lifted ever as long as Saddam is in power, whatever he does?

BERGER: No. Let Saddam Hussein -- let Saddam Hussein come into compliance, and then we can discuss whether there are any circumstances.

QUESTION: But Sandy, for the record, can you say that...

BERGER: It has been our position consistently that Saddam Hussein has to comply with all the relative Security Council resolutions from this action.

QUESTION: Does this mean for the record that were he to comply -- in other words, the point is moot for you (OFF-MIKE) -- were he to comply with the sanctions, the U.S. would not block the UN from lifting the sanctions?

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

BERGER: Well, I don't think, under these circumstances, when he has blatantly out of compliance, it is the right time for us to talk about how we lift the sanctions.

*** Elapsed Time 00:26, Eastern Time 15:11 ***

I mean, you know, that's -- we're not going to negotiate lifting the sanctions at a time when he is blatant disregard of not only the sanctions, but also of the Security Council resolutions.

QUESTION: It's not the matter of negotiating. It's the point that we're searching what is in the resolution. They -- you know, they say that, if he complies, if there is a rule that he has complied to sanctions, would you direct (ph) it? Is the U.S. position right now that they would direct it or (OFF-MIKE)...

BERGER: It's been the U.S. position since the Bush administration that Saddam Hussein comply -- has to comply with all of the relevant Security Council resolutions.

QUESTION: Not to belabor -- not to belabor a quote, but what the president said -- what he has just done is to ensure that the sanctions will be there until the end of time or as long as he lasts.

BERGER: Well, that's right, and that's not inconsistent with what I've said. In other words, there's no way -- if he is -- if he's got to be in compliance, he can't be in compliance if he's thrown the UNSCOM people out. So it's a necessary condition. It may not be a sufficient condition. He certainly cannot come back -- come into compliance when he's thrown the UN inspectors out, and as long as they're out, there's no way we can have an argument about whether he's in compliance.

QUESTION: Sandy, as the president's national security adviser, how concerned are you and how concerned ought the American people to be about the fact that we are now, for all intents and purposes, blind in Iraq to what he can do with those weapons of mass destruction?

*** Elapsed Time 00:27, Eastern Time 15:12 ***

BERGER: Well, let me -- let me just -- let me put it this way. I don't believe that he can redo -- the UNSCOM inspectors have been extraordinarily successful over the last six years, and a large portion of Saddam's weapons of mass destruction have been identified and destroyed. I don't believe that he can redo in a few weeks what UNSCOM has destroyed and -- over six years. But certainly, left to his own devices over a long period of time without international inspection, it is a danger.

QUESTION: Sandy, could you...

UNKNOWN: Last question (OFF-MIKE).

*** Elapsed Time 00:28, Eastern Time 15:13 ***

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

QUESTION: ... reassure the public that the United States has the intelligence and the military capacity to destroy Iraq's ability to deliver weapons of mass destruction, or are we limited in what we can do even if we wanted to?

BERGER: No, I don't think it's appropriate for me to talk about what our military capacity is or not. I think that's a mistake.

QUESTION: Sandy, have you made any headway with...

QUESTION: What were the (OFF-MIKE) -- Mike McCurry said again here today that although you and the president and Madeleine Albright are all working to try to get support from allies, support from the UN, if necessary, the president could act unilaterally and he could do so legally.

Can you explain that? Would it be because any nation has a right to protect itself? And could the president argue that Saddam Hussein is a threat to the United States?

BERGER: There is a body of UN Security Council resolutions that go back for six years, which in our view confers all the authority that we would need. But obviously, it is our first preference to resolve this without -- by diplomacy and peaceful means, and that's what we are engaged in over the next several days in terms of trying to work with our allies, some of whom have more contact with Saddam Hussein than we do, to make it clear that the international community is resolute with respect to this breach.

*** Elapsed Time 00:29, Eastern Time 15:14 ***

QUESTION: You've got to go see...

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) make it sound useful at this point?

BERGER: Excuse me?

QUESTION: How could the French government make itself useful to the international effort at this point? And what would you like to see from Paris?

BERGER: Well, I think the government of France, as other governments, need to convey -- hopefully will convey -- and I believe have conveyed to Saddam Hussein that he is totally outside the realm of any kind of acceptability from the international community when he throws out these inspectors, and that the only way that he can get back into any kind of dialogue with the international community is by coming back -- allowing those inspectors back.

*** Elapsed Time 00:30, Eastern Time 15:15 ***

(UNKNOWN): Thanks, Sandy.

(UNKNOWN): We still have -- we still have Gene Sperling, Frank Raines, Janet Yellen, and Elena Kagan here to answer any further questions about the year-end report.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

(UNKNOWN): Anybody have any questions? Why don't you all come up?

QUESTION: What's the next budget...

FRANKLIN RAINES, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET: What's the next...

QUESTION: How are you coming along in preparing the budget?

RAINES: We are in the process now of reviewing the proposals from the agencies and the president will be making his decisions in December for the 1999 budget.

But let me say one thing in following up what Erskine said.

The president presented his budget in February. Since that time, 15 very important bills have passed to implement that budget -- the tax cut bill, the balanced budget bill and 13 appropriations bills.

*** Elapsed Time 00:31, Eastern Time 15:16 ***

And just as the president said that his plan presented in February would lead us to a balanced budget, indeed, it will lead us to a balanced budget. And just as he said that it would implement his priorities, indeed, through that -- those 15 bills that Congress has enacted on a bipartisan basis, the president's program has, in fact, been enacted, whether you look at education or you look at the support for families in raising their kids or if you look at the environment. You see that the president's program has been enacted.

The important part of this isn't simply that we said so in February, but if you look one year ago -- one year ago -- the convention wisdom was that the struggle with the Republican majority where we were so far apart on priorities would inevitably lead to a clash, and no results.

And if it didn't lead to a clash, it would lead to the president having to retreat from his priorities and principles.

*** Elapsed Time 00:32, Eastern Time 15:17 ***

But if you match up the president's budget and the Republican plan of last year to what has actually happened, case after case, what the president has proposed has actually been enacted into law.

RAINES: So, we're no longer at the stage of speculating as to whether or not we could achieve this. In fact, through the enactment of 15 separate bills, the president's plan is now the law of the land.

QUESTION: Speaker Gingrich, yesterday, said he wouldn't be surprised if the president embraces the marriage in eliminating the marriage tax penalty. Given the White House is looking at the budget surplus and ways in which the tax code could be changed, is that one option that you're entertaining?

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

RAINES: Well, the -- as all of us have tried to say, that we don't want to spend the surplus before it's time. So we would prefer to see any surplus arrive before we had conclusions on how to spend it.

But we are looking as part of his policy process and this is the National Economic Council, as well as OMB, his council of economic advisers, had a broad range of policy initiatives that the president can address in his State of the Union address and in his budget.

*** Elapsed Time 00:33, Eastern Time 15:18 ***

And so we are looking at a broad range of things, and I think that just as people were impressed by the array of proposals that he made this last January, I think they'll be impressed by his State of the Union speech this coming January.

QUESTION: Is that going to be an issue in terms of tax (OFF- MIKE)?

RAINES: Well, there are a lot of issues in our tax system that the president has spoken to.

We have managed to deal with several of them in terms of incentives in the tax system for education and for raising kids. But there are issues of tax equity that he is quite concerned about. And he has asked all of us to look at those issues as well as the issues of long-term entitlements, to see what kinds of proposals we can make now to move closer to a resolution of those issues.

QUESTION: When do you submit the budget?

RAINES: The first week -- the first week of February.

OK?

*** Elapsed Time 00:34, Eastern Time 15:19 ***

QUESTION: You are all here for a reason, and I wonder if I could get somebody, Mr. Raines or Gene, to simply deal with this unspoke, unasked answer to lame duck questions straight out, because that's what this is all about, I assume.

QUESTION: What's your impression of those assessments that fast-track signaled the end of all this success and that now we're into a different kind of period.

RAINES: Well, I'm sort of the new guy here. But I remember when I was appointed to this office, people asked me, why are you going in there? I mean, this was last April. And they said, he's a lame duck, isn't he? The president -- we've got a Republican Congress -- how in the world can anything happen?

And I would just hold up the last year as testament that any time anyone calls this president a lame duck, he seems to have a very good following year. So I'm not concerned about that. We have an enormous, an enormous opportunity to pursue the president's program, and I expect we'll be as successful in this coming year as we were in the last year.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

*** Elapsed Time 00:35, Eastern Time 15:20 ***

This past year has probably been the largest change in fiscal and domestic economic policy that we've seen in 30 years, and we're seeing the results in the economy that continues to grow and produce jobs at low inflation. We're seeing the results in improved fiscal policy, lower deficits. I think we couldn't have seen a better year. And I expect that we'll continue to see one. This is an opportunity for this entire administration to continue to produce. Indeed, I think if we focus on the 15 bills that I mentioned, and there could be another 15 I could have mentioned that are not appropriations bills, you would see this was one of the most productive sessions of Congress that we've had in a long time.

QUESTION: Are you staying on?

RAINES: Me? Oh, absolutely. I mean, what else would you do other than be OMB director?

(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: But there are so many rumors every other day that you're leaving.

*** Elapsed Time 00:36, Eastern Time 15:21 ***

RAINES: Me? No, I'm not. I think you're confusing me with somebody else.

(LAUGHTER)

No, no, no. I have -- the OMB troops are here. We're going to produce the president's budget, and we'll be here to give you all these wonderful briefings in the future.

QUESTION: Oh, God.

(LAUGHTER)

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) about Korea, whether or not you're watching what's going on in Korea and whether or not the U.S. would participate in any sort of bail-out funds for Korea?

SPERLING: Obviously, we're always watching, particularly Treasury Department, and obviously Deputy Secretary Summers is, will be going to Manila as part of the deputy finance ministers. So, you know, it's never -- we're always watching, and it almost never does any good to say anything, speculate or say anything about these situations.

*** Elapsed Time 00:37, Eastern Time 15:22 ***

QUESTION: Could the cut-off of the government funding create a problem for the administration in participating in discussions, though?

SPERLING: I think Erskine's already, I think Erskine's already answered it, and so...

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

QUESTION: Gene, you're close to a lot of House Democrats.

QUESTION: Is it your sense that some of the problems are related, they were isolated strictly to the issue of trade, or are there broader concerns that the -- in the relationship that the White House should be moving to correct?

SPERLING: I think trade in the House was always going to be a tough issue, and I think that it was -- it was always going to be difficult. There were real differences, real differences of opinion. And I don't think they have, you know, much to do with, you know, the timing of the presidential -- the president's term or anything else. That was always going to be a -- that was always going to be a tough battle.

I think that there are plenty of things that are going to unite Democrats going forward, I think, certainly education, certainly children's issues, including childcare, certainly tobacco.

*** Elapsed Time 00:38, Eastern Time 15:23 ***

So I think that there will be -- I think you'll see Democrats, you know, fighting together on many fronts, but as Erskine said, when we -- in order to get something done, you ultimately have to be able to work in a bipartisan way. And when we -- whenever we see that opportunity, our goal is to -- you know, we're going to try to do that.

QUESTION: On the issue of fairness as it relates to entitlement reform, I guess this is directed to the OMB director again, are you speaking in terms of perhaps means testing Medicare or something along that line if you're concerned about future solvency and how to address that issue?

*** Elapsed Time 00:39, Eastern Time 15:24 ***

RAINES: Well, as you know, the -- we have had -- we had discussions in the balanced budget negotiations about the structure of Medicare and in that case there were discussions about how the premiums might be adjusted or those with the highest income.

And those did not happen as part of that reform, although we did manage to extend the life of the Medicare system for 10 to 12 years. We're going to appointing a Medicare commission next month and these issues will be on their agenda for them to make recommendations to the president and Congress.

SPERLING: Just one last thing. The president has signed into law -- and, Frank, you'll be interested to hear this -- the president has signed into law the sixth and final continuing resolution for fiscal year 1998. This extends until the 26th of November. This gives the Congress enough time to process the bills and get them over here. It gives the White House enough time to review the bills before the president acts on them.

*** Elapsed Time 00:40, Eastern Time 15:25 ***

END

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 14, 1997

NOTES:

???? - Indicates Speaker Unkown
- Could not make out what was being said.
off mike - Indicates Could not make out what was being said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 15, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 104 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Associated Press
AP Online

November 10, 1997; Monday 13:31 Eastern Time

SECTION: Washington - general news

LENGTH: 651 words

HEADLINE: Clinton Opens Hate Crime Conference

BYLINE: SONYA ROSS

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Noting an alarming rise in hate crimes but uncertain of how it happened, President Clinton called today for broader laws to penalize acts of violence based on gender, disability or sexual orientation.

The president kicked off a White House Conference on Hate Crimes by endorsing a plan by Sens. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., and Arlen Specter, R-Pa., to make it illegal to injure someone because they are gay, disabled or a member of the opposite sex.

"All Americans deserve protection from hate," Clinton said. "We should make our current laws tougher to include all hate crimes that cause physical harm."

The president was interrupted by a heckler who shouted: "If you murder Vince Foster, it is not a hate crime." It was a reference to a longtime friend and former aide to Clinton who committed suicide in 1993.

"We have the First Amendment, even here," Clinton replied. "But I think the hate's coming from your way, not mine."

Clinton said Americans can no longer ignore "what happens when racial or ethnic or religious animosity joins with lawlessness." He announced measures that include allowing victims of housing-related hate crimes to seek monetary damages from their attackers and devoting up to 50 extra FBI agents and federal prosecutors toward enforcing hate crime laws.

"Anybody who thinks that in the world of today and tomorrow that he or she can hide from the kind of poison that we see in various places in our country

AP Online, November 10, 1997

is living in a dream world," Clinton said. "Whether we like it or not, our futures are bound together, and it is time we acted like it."

The conference, involving about 350 people, is an offshoot of the president's race relations initiative. It was convened in part to address concerns raised by gay and lesbian activists that are not directly covered by the race effort.

Besides law enforcement, the participants in today's conference were to include civil rights activists, educators, religious leaders and victims of hate crimes.

The conference drew at least one note of protest. The National European American Society, a private advocacy group for whites, took exception to being excluded from the conference.

In a letter to FBI Director Louis Freeh, the group's researcher, Joseph Fallon, argued that while victims of hate crimes are identified by race, ethnicity or sexual orientation, the perpetrators of such crimes are labeled only by race. Fallon said that unfairly inflates the number of offenders classified as white, promoting "a false and inflammatory view of European Americans."

"If law enforcement agencies can identify a known victim of a hate crime as a Hispanic," Fallon wrote, "they can just as easily ascertain whether a known perpetrator of a hate crime is a Hispanic."

According to Justice Department statistics, 8,759 hate crimes were reported in 1996, compared with 7,947 reported in the previous year. White House officials said they are not sure whether the increase indicates that hate crimes are up or that they are reported better.

Race was a factor in 63 percent of all reported hate crimes, followed by religion, 13.9 percent; sexual orientation, 12 percent; and ethnic origin, 11 percent. The White House did not provide a breakdown by race.

The efforts Clinton was announcing today are designed to ensure that current laws are working and are leading to arrests, said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy.

She noted that 30 percent of hate crime victims require hospitalization after an attack. By comparison, only 7 percent of victims of other crimes are hospitalized.

"So these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent," Kagan said.

Today's conference was following up on Clinton's landmark speech over the weekend before the Human Rights Coalition. It was the first time a sitting president publicly before a gay and lesbian group.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 10, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 105 OF 166 STORIES

The Associated Press

The materials in the AP file were compiled by The Associated Press. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Associated Press.

November 10, 1997, Monday, PM cycle

SECTION: Washington Dateline

LENGTH: 644 words

HEADLINE: President convening meeting to consider responses to hate crimes

BYLINE: By SONYA ROSS, Associated Press Writer

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Noting an alarming rise in hate crimes but uncertain of how it happened, President Clinton called today for broader laws to penalize acts of violence based on gender, disability or sexual orientation.

The president kicked off a White House Conference on Hate Crimes by endorsing a plan by Sens. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., and Arlen Specter, R-Pa., to make it illegal to injure someone because they are gay, disabled or a member of the opposite sex.

"All Americans deserve protection from hate," Clinton said. "We should make our current laws tougher to include all hate crimes that cause physical harm."

The president was interrupted by a heckler who shouted: "If you murder Vince Foster, it is not a hate crime." It was a reference to a longtime friend and former aide to Clinton who committed suicide in 1993.

"We have the First Amendment, even here," Clinton replied. "But I think the hate's coming from your way, not mine."

Clinton said Americans can no longer ignore "what happens when racial or ethnic or religious animosity joins with lawlessness." He announced measures that include allowing victims of housing-related hate crimes to seek monetary damages from their attackers and devoting up to 50 extra FBI agents and federal prosecutors toward enforcing hate crime laws.

"Anybody who thinks that in the world of today and tomorrow that he or she can hide from the kind of poison that we see in various places in our country is living in a dream world," Clinton said. "Whether we like it or not, our futures are bound together, and it is time we acted like it."

The conference, involving about 350 people, is an offshoot of the president's race relations initiative. It was convened in part to address concerns raised by gay and lesbian activists that are not directly covered by the race effort.

Besides law enforcement, the participants in today's conference were to include civil rights activists, educators, religious leaders and victims of

The Associated Press, November 10, 1997

hate crimes.

The conference drew at least one note of protest. The National European American Society, a private advocacy group for whites, took exception to being excluded from the conference.

In a letter to FBI Director Louis Freeh, the group's researcher, Joseph Fallon, argued that while victims of hate crimes are identified by race, ethnicity or sexual orientation, the perpetrators of such crimes are labeled only by race. Fallon said that unfairly inflates the number of offenders classified as white, promoting "a false and inflammatory view of European Americans."

"If law enforcement agencies can identify a known victim of a hate crime as a Hispanic," Fallon wrote, "they can just as easily ascertain whether a known perpetrator of a hate crime is a Hispanic."

According to Justice Department statistics, 8,759 hate crimes were reported in 1996, compared with 7,947 reported in the previous year. White House officials said they are not sure whether the increase indicates that hate crimes are up or that they are reported better.

Race was a factor in 63 percent of all reported hate crimes, followed by religion, 13.9 percent; sexual orientation, 12 percent; and ethnic origin, 11 percent. The White House did not provide a breakdown by race.

The efforts Clinton was announcing today are designed to ensure that current laws are working and are leading to arrests, said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy.

She noted that 30 percent of hate crime victims require hospitalization after an attack. By comparison, only 7 percent of victims of other crimes are hospitalized.

"So these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent," Kagan said.

Today's conference was following up on Clinton's landmark speech over the weekend before the Human Rights Coalition. It was the first time a sitting president publicly before a gay and lesbian group.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 10, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 106 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Charleston Newspapers
Charleston Daily Mail

November 10, 1997, Monday

SECTION: News; Pg. P8B

LENGTH: 586 words

Charleston Daily Mail, November 10, 1997

HEADLINE: Clinton targets hate crimes - President offering steps to curb sharp rise in reported cases

BODY:

WASHINGTON - Noting an alarming rise in hate crimes but uncertain of how it happened, President Clinton is gathering with law enforcement officials and others to consider how to confront the problem.

The president planned to kick off today's White House Conference on Hate Crimes by announcing a series of enforcement and prevention efforts.

The conference, involving about 350 people, is an offshoot of the president's race relations initiative. It was convened in part to address concerns raised by gay and lesbian activists that are not directly covered by the race effort.

"We're drawing a line against hate," said Maria Echaveste, White House director of public liaison.

"There should be no question anywhere around this country that we do not tolerate violence against a person because of what they look like, what they believe in, because of their sexual orientation."

Besides law enforcement, the participants in today's conference were to include civil rights activists, educators, religious leaders and victims of hate crimes.

The conference drew at least one note of protest. The National European American Society, a private advocacy group for whites, took exception to being excluded from the conference.

In a letter to FBI Director Louis Freeh, the group's researcher, Joseph Fallon, argued that while victims of hate crimes are identified by race, ethnicity or sexual orientation, the perpetrators of such crimes are labeled only by race.

Charleston Daily Mail, November 10, 1997

Fallon said that unfairly inflates the number of offenders classified as white, promoting "a false and inflammatory view of European Americans."

"If law enforcement agencies can identify a known victim of a hate crime as a Hispanic," Fallon wrote, "they can just as easily ascertain whether a known perpetrator of a hate crime is a Hispanic." According to Justice Department statistics, 8,759 hate crimes were reported in 1996, compared with 7,947 reported in the previous year. White House officials said they are not sure whether the increase indicates that hate crimes are up or that they are reported better. Race was a factor in 63 percent of all reported hate crimes, followed by religion, 13.9 percent; sexual orientation, 12 percent; and ethnic origin, 11 percent. The White House did not provide a breakdown by race.

The efforts Clinton was announcing today are designed to ensure that current laws are working and are leading to arrests, said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy.

She noted that 30 percent of hate crime victims require hospitalization after an attack. By comparison, only 7 percent of victims of other crimes are hospitalized.

"So these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent," Kagan said.

Today's conference was following up on Clinton's landmark speech over the weekend before the Human Rights Coalition. It was the first time a sitting president publicly before a gay and lesbian group.

In an interview on NBC's "Meet the Press" aired Sunday, the president said that while dealing with the crime of gay-bashing is

Charleston Daily Mail, November 10, 1997

urgent, it may be easier to resolve if the root cause of all hate crimes is better addressed.

"We're going to deal with that not only against homosexuals, but against other groups of Americans," he said.

"The real problem in America is still continuing discrimination and fear and downright misunderstanding."

LOAD-DATE: November 12, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 107 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 M2 Communications Ltd.
M2 PRESSWIRE

November 10, 1997

LENGTH: 2670 words

HEADLINE: THE WHITE HOUSE

Press briefing by Maria Echaveste and Elena Kagan

HIGHLIGHT:

The Briefing Room

BODY:

MR. LOCKHART: Good afternoon, everyone. Before Mike comes out for the regular daily briefing, we are joined by Maria Echaveste, who is the Director of the Office of Public Liaison; and Elena Kagan, the Deputy Director of the Domestic Policy Council. They're going to give us a little rundown of the White House Conference on Hate Crimes, which is scheduled for Monday, give you an outline of what we expect the agenda to be, who will be participating. And they'll be glad to take any questions you have. Thanks.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Good afternoon. Just some background, why we're having the White House Conference on Hate Crimes. As part of our outreach and soliciting input on the President's Initiative on Race, one of the issues that people talked a lot to us about was the existence of hate crimes and what people perceive to be an increase in hate crimes, and this is an issue that we really decided to take a look at.

While a majority of hate crimes seem to be against people of color, there are hate crimes against people based on their beliefs, religious beliefs, sexual orientation. About six months ago the Attorney General put together a working group at the Department of Justice at the President's request to develop recommendations to tackle this problem.

So on Monday we will have this conference. It will be organized as follows. We have over 350 people coming from all over the country. A good portion are law enforcement, state and local officials - because law enforcement is a very significant partner in trying to combat hate crimes.

M2 PRESSWIRE November 10, 1997

We will start off with a breakfast here at the White House that will be closed to the press, and then we will move over to GW, at which point the President will start the conference by making some opening remarks, will be making some announcements. And then he will moderate a panel with seven other individuals that include: a principal from Mamaroneck, New York, who after a series of hate crimes in Mamaroneck, which is a suburb in Westchester County, he organized a community effort to combat; a woman from Montana, who was the subject of anti-Semitic hate crimes and who organized her community to have both Jews and non-Jews put menorahs in their windows to show the community's response against hate crimes.

Fundamentally, this is about being tough on hate crimes. We're drawing a line against hate. There should be no question anywhere around this country that we do not tolerate violence against a person because of what they look like, what they believe in, because of their sexual orientation. There should be a broad consensus, indeed unanimity, that violence against an individual because of an individual's characteristics is wrong.

And so there will be law enforcement and prevention announcements on Monday. After the President's remarks we will then have a series of workshops moderated by members of the Cabinet. We have full participation, beginning with the Attorney General and including people like Secretary Cuomo, Secretary Riley, Secretary Slater; breaking into workshops - then that will be about an hour and a half - and then we will have the Attorney General get a report back from each of the moderators in terms of what was discussed and possible actions after the conference.

So why don't I stop there and let Elena talk a little bit about some of the data or statistics and facts that we have regarding hate crimes.

MS. KAGAN: I'll give you a little bit of the data, but I'll warn you first that the data we have, the statistics we have are not all that meaningful, and that's principally because hate crimes, we have every reason to think, are dramatically under-reported. They're under-reported for two reasons: first, because victims themselves are often embarrassed about the crimes or hesitant for other reasons to report them; and second, because under the existing system communities report crimes to the Justice Department in order to get aggregate figures voluntarily. Not all communities do that. There has been a steady increase each year in the number of communities that participate in this reporting system, but we're not yet at a hundred percent, so the statistics that I will give you are almost surely under what is truly happening out there.

And it's also very difficult from these statistics to actually figure out what the trends are, whether there are more hate crimes each year, whether they're staying the same, or whether there are even fewer. The statistics, as you'll see, go up, but it's hard to know whether that's because incidents are increasing or because the reporting is getting better.

But the total number of hate crimes in 1996, hate crime incidents reported, were 8,759. In 1995, it was 7,947. So there is an increase but, again, it's hard to know whether that's an increase in the actual incidents or just better reporting.

In terms of what kinds of crimes these are, the 1996 figures show that racial bias accounts for over 60 percent of the reported hate crimes,

M2 PRESSWIRE November 10, 1997

precisely 63.13. Religious bias accounts for 13.9 percent. Ethnicity, which is often crimes against people of Hispanic origin, count for 11 percent. And sexual orientation counts for about 12 percent of those crimes. That's a little bit about the statistics.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Questions?

Q Do you anticipate increased penalties for hate crimes as a result of this conference, recommended by the Attorney General?

MS. KAGAN: Well, we're going to have more to say about the announcements that we're going to make on Monday, and I don't want to say now what the President is going to call for, but the President is going to talk about law enforcement efforts, making sure that the laws we have on the book appropriately protect all our citizens and then making sure that those laws are enforced so that we're actually bringing the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. So I guess that's all I want to say about that now.

Q This question is for Maria. Maria, what groups - what civil rights are going to be attending and what parts are they playing Monday in the workshops?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Did you say "civil rights groups"?

Q Yes.

MS. ECHAVESTE: The participants really - it ranges everything from the usual organizations like ADL and National Council - Leadership Conference. But we also try to get individuals from community organizations from around the country. And I do want to stress the law enforcement participation. This is a significant piece, because one of the things that we've learned is that people who have been the victims of hate crimes have in the past been reluctant to report their crimes to their local police, if it was a crime because of sexual orientation, feeling there would be a lack of sympathy, a lack of responsiveness. And we really want to hear from law enforcement officials who have developed their task forces or their community response in order to teach others on how to do it.

I think the important thing about a hate crime is not every act of violence is, in fact, a hate crime. And oftentimes you don't know that is in indeed a hate crime until you've finished your investigation, in order to understand the motivation. And so this makes it a little more difficult to investigate.

Q First of all, about the connection between the remarks the President is going to make tomorrow night and the conference on Monday. Do you have anything to say about that?

MS. ECHAVESTE: We announced the date of the conference in June and it just was fortuitous that we had accepted the HRC dinner a few months later.

Q The second thing is with regard to education or the educational community, so to speak. A lot of this goes on in schools or with students to other students and in many communities is simply treated as a law enforcement issue. The schools boards or the administrations don't want to get involved. So -

MS. ECHAVESTE: That's absolutely - in fact we have two workshops: one on hate crimes in K through 12 - just having that title makes you cringe a little

M2 PRESSWIRE November 10, 1997

bit to think that students will be harassing and possibly engaging in physical attacks against fellow students when they're fairly young. We'll also have one on hate crimes on college campuses - on campus - because the education piece is very, very important.

Q Why did you decide to do this now? I mean, what - can you explain the timing? Why didn't this happen four years ago?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, all I can tell you in terms of what we've been working on - since I've gotten here at any rate - as I said, the idea came about as we were exploring and getting options and input on the President's Initiative on Race. And a number of groups came to us and said, you know, there is this problem of hate crimes and it really needs some visibility and needs to be put on sort of center stage, and we want to encourage the White House to do it. And so in that context we thought a conference is a good way to do it and it can encompass a variety of different groups that are the subject of hate crimes.

Q What will you do with the information afterwards? What sort of follow-up will you have?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, I think a lot of it depends on the interactions and the suggestions that come out of the workshops. I think that you will see from the announcements on Monday that there will, indeed, be follow-up. This is a significant commitment.

Q How do you decide what a hate crime is? Why is it a hate crime when it's against somebody who's a different race, but not a hate crime if it's somebody who's a different gender, for instance?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, that's precisely what I was getting to. They're trying to determine the motivations. There are those who argue that there are gender-based hate crimes. Those would be, obviously, very difficult - could be very difficult to investigate - I think not every rape would qualify as a hate crime. On the other hand, there could be instances or - not every act of violence against an African American by a white person is - or a Latino is necessarily a hate crime.

What we hope to learn from our law enforcement folks who will be attending on Monday is - one of the panels is law enforcement response to hate crime - how do you go about determining what is a hate crime. And it has to do with motivation and the identity of the victim. If the victim's characteristic was what led to the crime, as opposed to other motivations for crime, it's more difficult.

I think one of the statistics that Elena had, had to do with the percentage of victims who are - of hate crimes who require hospitalization versus those who are victims of other crimes. And I think it was like 30 percent.

MS. KAGAN: I think it's 30 percent of the victims of hate crime require hospitalization, and only 7 percent of non-hate crimes require hospitalization. So these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent.

Q Will there be any focus at the conference on the increasing number of hate sites on the Internet?

M2 PRESSWIRE November 10, 1997

MS. ECHAVESTE: I don't - Richard -

MR. SOCARIDES: In the last break-out group -

MS. ECHAVESTE: I'm sorry, thank you for reminding me. One of the other workshops is combatting organized hate. That is, a workshop will be focused on groups that are organized around hate. And in that context, we should be discussing those things.

Q Why is this a federal issue, since criminal justice is basically a state and local issue?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we do have federal hate crimes laws, and so there is federal law in this area.

Q Criminal?

MS. ECHAVESTE: There is federal criminal law in this area.

Q Maria, pretty much we understand that the Race Advisory Board is trying to target more so youth as far as dealing with the racial issue. Are you going to, Monday, deal with more so youth-oriented issues with them, target youth as well?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, one of the participants on the President's panel is a sophomore in high school, a Filipino student who is part of an effort of the ADL's Children of Dreams program, who's working on peer training and to mediate tensions between groups. So there are young people involved in Monday's conference.

Q Do the statistics reflect the strength of organized hate groups? Are groups like the Klan and neo-Nazi groups on the increase? Do these numbers show anything in that regard?

MS. KAGAN: The aggregate numbers that we have are not broken down like that, so it's hard to say how much of them are crimes of organized hate groups and how much are the crimes of often, as one person said, teenagers acting sort of alone or in gangs of some kind. The statistics just don't give any indication.

Q Anecdotally, do you know? Do some of the experts that you've consulted ahead of this conference tell you anything about the strength of the presence of hate groups in the country?

MS. KAGAN: There is, obviously, still too much activity by hate groups and too many crimes committed by them. Klan Watch documented 51 cases of cross burnings in the United States in 1996. That's maybe one indication of the kind of crimes committed by a particular hate group.

But this is one of the things that's going to be talked about in one of these break-out sessions, is how prevalent these organized groups are, what kind of crimes they're committing and what we ought to do to respond to their activity.

Q Could you tell us the names of the workshops, so that we know what -

M2 PRESSWIRE November 10, 1997

MS. ECHAVESTE: It's in the press advisory.

MR. LOCKHART: It will be available right after the briefing.

Q Would the Oklahoma City bombing qualify as a hate crime under your definitions?

MS. ECHAVESTE: No. Although it sort of represents how difficult it is to take on this issue. But because it

- we sort of - that's domestic terrorism; it is focused on an issue, if you will, not against particular individuals, the characteristic of the individual as we saw in terms of the people who got hurt - it crossed the lines of people who got hurt.

It's the same way that clinic violence would not - although some groups have asked that it be considered a hate crime, it would not meet the strict definition.

Q Do you have statistics on hate crimes committed on college campuses?

MS. ECHAVESTE: No. In fact, one of the workshops will be about the need for data. And I think out of that we might find some suggestions in terms of what kind of data needs to be collected in order to be able - like with any problem, you need the facts in order to devise strategies for combating and resolving those kinds of problems. So I think we might get some good suggestions.

Q Talking about the definition - I'm still unclear

- these 8,759 reported last year, are they hate crimes as defined by the responsible particular law enforcement agency, that they felt was a -

MS. KAGAN: That's right. And often it depends on their own law and the definition of hate crimes in their own law, and that does vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. But for the most part, state laws look at the same thing, which is whether the attack or the other kind of crime was motivated by some kind of bias or animus against a characteristic of the victim - whether that's sexual orientation, or race, or gender, or what have you.

Q What can we expect to see Monday? Are we going to see something like we saw with some of the Race Advisory Board meetings where you just have pretty much experts just talking, or do you have interactive

-

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we have the - as I described, we have - over 350 people. There will be plenary session in which the President addresses them, and then the President moderates the panel of seven people that will be discussing the issue of hate crimes. Then they do breakout sessions and they'll be broken into 50 people per breakout. And then they'll be brought back together again. So there will be interaction among folks and then those discussion groups.

Any other questions?

M2 PRESSWIRE November 10, 1997

Great. Thank you.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: November 11, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 108 OF 166 STORIES.

Copyright 1997 Xinhua News Agency

The materials in the Xinhua file were compiled by The Xinhua News Agency. These materials may not be republished without the express written consent of The Xinhua News Agency.

NOVEMBER 10, 1997, MONDAY

LENGTH: 228 words

HEADLINE: clinton convenes conference on hate crimes

DATELINE: washington, november 10; ITEM NO: 1110250

BODY:

faced with increased hate crimes in the country, u.s. president bill clinton is gathering law enforcement officials and others to consider how to deal with the problem. the conference, involving about 350 people, is an offshoot of the president's race relations initiative. besides law enforcement, the participants in today's white house conference were to include civil rights activists, educators, religious leaders and victims of hate crimes. according to justice department statistics, 8,759 hate crimes were reported in 1996, compared with 7,947 reported in the previous year. white house officials said they are not sure whether the increase indicates that hate crimes are up or that they are reported better. race was a factor in 63 percent of all reported hate crimes, followed by religion, 13.9 percent; sexual orientation, 12 percent; and ethnic origin, 11 percent. the efforts clinton was expected to announce today are designed to ensure that current laws are working and are leading to arrests, said elena kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy. she said hate crimes "tend to be serious and often violent." in an interview on nbc's "meet the press" aired sunday, clinton said, "the real problem in america is still continuing discrimination and fear and downright misunderstanding."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 11, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 109 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Denver Publishing Company
Denver Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO)

November 8, 1997, Saturday

Denver Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO), November 8, 1997

SECTION: NEWS/NATIONAL/INTERNATIONAL; Ed. F; Pg. 57A

LENGTH: 361 words

HEADLINE: Clinton is asked to omit anti gays as hate topic
President schedules 1 day conference at White House on Monday

BYLINE: Ann McFeatters; Scripps Howard News Service

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

President Clinton holds a one-day White House Conference on Hate Crimes on Monday, but is being urged not to include opposition to homosexuality in that category.

The Traditional Values Coalition, which says it represents 32,000 churches in opposing abortion, homosexuality and pornography, said Friday it fears that the conference and Clinton's overtures to the gay community would come close to "lumping the objections of religious citizens to homosexuality in some sort of hate crime."

Andrea Sheldon, executive director of the coalition, said her group opposes violence, but is worried that the administration is leaning toward labeling activists who oppose gay rights as engaging in hate crimes. She said there already is a "subtle" campaign under way in schools to teach children that "opposing homosexuality is bad."

She also condemned Clinton's decision to speak tonight at the Human Rights Campaign dinner to raise money for anti-discrimination legislation for gays.

The White House said Clinton wanted to speak at the Human Rights Campaign dinner to condemn job discrimination against homosexuals and to promote the force of law behind that effort.

White House aides Maria Echaveste, director of public liaison, and Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy, said Friday that at the hate crimes summit, expected to draw about 350 people, Clinton will call for more law enforcement against hate crimes and more meaningful statistics.

Officially, there were 8,759 hate crimes last year, compared with 7,947 in 1995, both figures believed to be lower than the true number. Many communities do not report them. The perceived breakdown is that 63 percent are race-related, 14 percent reflect religious bias, 11 percent are based on ethnic prejudice and 12 percent are against homosexuals.

Kagan said that 30 percent of the victims of hate crimes end up in the hospital compared with 7 percent of victims in other crimes. Echaveste said that Clinton wanted to hold the conference because the issue of hate crimes kept coming up as he pushed his initiative to have a national discussion on race relations.

LANGUAGE: English

Denver Rocky Mountain News (Denver, CO), November 8, 1997

LOAD-DATE: November 11, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 110 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 U.S. Newswire, Inc.
U.S. Newswire

November 07, 1997 9:44 Eastern Time

SECTION: NATIONAL DESK

LENGTH: 1695 words

HEADLINE: Transcript of White House Press Briefing on Hate Crimes by Echaveste, Kagan (1 of 2)

CONTACT: White House Press Office, 202-456-2100

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, Nov. 7

BODY:

Following is a transcript of a White House press briefing on hate crimes by Assistant to the President and Director of Public Liaison Maria Echaveste, and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Elena Kagan (1 of 2) :

The Briefing Room
1:13 P.M. EST

MR. LOCKHART: Good afternoon, everyone. Before Mike comes out for the regular daily briefing, we are joined by Maria Echaveste, who is the Director of the Office of Public Liaison; and Elena Kagan, the Deputy Director of the Domestic Policy Council. They're going to give us a little rundown of the White House Conference on Hate Crimes, which is scheduled for Monday, give you an outline of what we expect the agenda to be, who will be participating. And they'll be glad to take any questions you have. Thanks.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Good afternoon. Just some background, why we're having the White House Conference on Hate Crimes. As part of our outreach and soliciting input on the President's Initiative on Race, one of the issues that people talked a lot to us about was the existence of hate crimes and what people perceive to be an increase in hate crimes, and this is an issue that we really decided to take a look at.

While a majority of hate crimes seem to be against people of color, there are hate crimes against people based on their beliefs, religious beliefs, sexual orientation. About six months ago the Attorney General put together a working group at the Department of Justice at the President's request to develop recommendations to tackle this problem.

So on Monday we will have this conference. It will be organized as follows. We have over 350 people coming from all over the country. A good portion are law enforcement, state and local officials -- because law enforcement is a very significant partner in trying to combat hate crimes.

U.S. Newswire, November 07, 1997

We will start off with a breakfast here at the White House that will be closed to the press, and then we will move over to GW, at which point the President will start the conference by making some opening remarks, will be making some announcements. And then he will moderate a panel with seven other individuals that include: a principal from Mamaroneck, New York, who after a series of hate crimes in Mamaroneck, which is a suburb in Westchester County, he organized a community effort to combat; a woman from Montana, who was the subject of anti-Semitic hate crimes and who organized her community to have both Jews and non-Jews put menorahs in their windows to show the community's response against hate crimes.

Fundamentally, this is about being tough on hate crimes. We're drawing a line against hate. There should be no question anywhere around this country that we do not tolerate violence against a person because of what they look like, what they believe in, because of their sexual orientation. There should be a broad consensus, indeed unanimity, that violence against an individual because of an individual's characteristics is wrong.

And so there will be law enforcement and prevention announcements on Monday. After the President's remarks we will then have a series of workshops moderated by members of the Cabinet. We have full participation, beginning with the Attorney General and including people like Secretary Cuomo, Secretary Riley, Secretary Slater; breaking into workshops -- then that will be about an hour and a half -- and then we will have the Attorney General get a report back from each of the moderators in terms of what was discussed and possible actions after the conference.

So why don't I stop there and let Elena talk a little bit about some of the data or statistics and facts that we have regarding hate crimes.

MS. KAGAN: I'll give you a little bit of the data, but I'll warn you first that the data we have, the statistics we have are not all that meaningful, and that's principally because hate crimes, we have every reason to think, are dramatically under-reported. They're under-reported for two reasons: first, because victims themselves are often embarrassed about the crimes or hesitant for other reasons to report them; and second, because under the existing system communities report crimes to the Justice Department in order to get aggregate figures voluntarily. Not all communities do that. There has been a steady increase each year in the number of communities that participate in this reporting system, but we're not yet at a hundred percent, so the statistics that I will give you are almost surely under what is truly happening out there.

And it's also very difficult from these statistics to actually figure out what the trends are, whether there are more hate crimes each year, whether they're staying the same, or whether there are even fewer. The statistics, as you'll see, go up, but it's hard to know whether that's because incidents are increasing or because the reporting is getting better.

But the total number of hate crimes in 1996, hate crime incidents reported, were 8,759. In 1995, it was 7,947. So there is an increase but, again, it's hard to know whether that's an increase in the actual incidents or just better reporting.

In terms of what kinds of crimes these are, the 1996 figures show that racial bias accounts for over 60 percent of the reported hate crimes.

U.S. Newswire, November 07, 1997

precisely 63.13. Religious bias accounts for 13.9 percent. Ethnicity, which is often crimes against people of Hispanic origin, count for 11 percent. And sexual orientation counts for about 12 percent of those crimes. That's a little bit about the statistics.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Questions?

Q Do you anticipate increased penalties for hate crimes as a result of this conference, recommended by the Attorney General?

MS. KAGAN: Well, we're going to have more to say about the announcements that we're going to make on Monday, and I don't want to say now what the President is going to call for, but the President is going to talk about law enforcement efforts, making sure that the laws we have on the book appropriately protect all our citizens and then making sure that those laws are enforced so that we're actually bringing the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. So I guess that's all I want to say about that now.

Q This question is for Maria. Maria, what groups -- what civil rights are going to be attending and what parts are they playing Monday in the workshops?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Did you say "civil rights groups"?

Q Yes.

MS. ECHAVESTE: The participants really -- it ranges everything from the usual organizations like ADL and National Council -- Leadership Conference. But we also try to get individuals from community organizations from around the country. And I do want to stress the law enforcement participation. This is a significant piece, because one of the things that we've learned is that people who have been the victims of hate crimes have in the past been reluctant to report their crimes to their local police, if it was a crime because of sexual orientation, feeling there would be a lack of sympathy, a lack of responsiveness. And we really want to hear from law enforcement officials who have developed their task forces or their community response in order to teach others on how to do it.

I think the important thing about a hate crime is not every act of violence is, in fact, a hate crime. And oftentimes you don't know that is in indeed a hate crime until you've finished your investigation, in order to understand the motivation. And so this makes it a little more difficult to investigate.

Q First of all, about the connection between the remarks the President is going to make tomorrow night and the conference on Monday. Do you have anything to say about that?

MS. ECHAVESTE: We announced the date of the conference in June and it just was fortuitous that we had accepted the HRC dinner a few months later.

Q The second thing is with regard to education or the educational community, so to speak. A lot of this goes on in schools or with students to other students and in many communities is simply treated as a law enforcement issue. The schools boards or the administrations don't want to get involved. So --

MS. ECHAVESTE: That's absolutely -- in fact we have two workshops: one on hate crimes in K through 12 -- just having that title makes you cringe a little bit to think that students will be harassing and possibly engaging in physical

U.S. Newswire, November 07, 1997

attacks against fellow students when they're fairly young. We'll also have one on hate crimes on college campuses -- on campus -- because the education piece is very, very important.

Q Why did you decide to do this now? I mean, what -- can you explain the timing? Why didn't this happen four years ago?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, all I can tell you in terms of what we've been working on -- since I've gotten here at any rate -- as I said, the idea came about as we were exploring and getting options and input on the President's Initiative on Race. And a number of groups came to us and said, you know, there is this problem of hate crimes and it really needs some visibility and needs to be put on sort of center stage, and we want to encourage the White House to do it. And so in that context we thought a conference is a good way to do it and it can encompass a variety of different groups that are the subject of hate crimes.

Q What will you do with the information afterwards? What sort of follow-up will you have?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, I think a lot of it depends on the interactions and the suggestions that come out of the workshops. I think that you will see from the announcements on Monday that there will, indeed, be follow-up. This is a significant commitment.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 7, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 111 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 U.S. Newswire, Inc.
U.S. Newswire

November 07, 1997 9:44 Eastern Time

SECTION: NATIONAL DESK

LENGTH: 1218 words

HEADLINE: Transcript of White House Press Briefing on Hate Crimes by Echaveste, Kagan (2 of 2)

CONTACT: White House Press Office, 202-456-2100

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, Nov. 7

BODY:
Following is a transcript of a White House press briefing on hate crimes by Assistant to the President and Director of Public Liaison Maria Echaveste, and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Elena Kagan (2 of 2) :

Q How do you decide what a hate crime is? Why is it a hate crime when

U.S. Newswire, November 07, 1997

it's against somebody who's a different race, but not a hate crime if it's somebody who's a different gender, for instance?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, that's precisely what I was getting to. They're trying to determine the motivations. There are those who argue that there are gender-based hate crimes. Those would be, obviously, very difficult -- could be very difficult to investigate -- I think not every rape would qualify as a hate crime. On the other hand, there could be instances or -- not every act of violence against an African American by a white person is -- or a Latino is necessarily a hate crime.

What we hope to learn from our law enforcement folks who will be attending on Monday is -- one of the panels is law enforcement response to hate crime -- how do you go about determining what is a hate crime. And it has to do with motivation and the identity of the victim. If the victim's characteristic was what led to the crime, as opposed to other motivations for crime, it's more difficult.

I think one of the statistics that Elena had, had to do with the percentage of victims who are -- of hate crimes who require hospitalization versus those who are victims of other crimes. And I think it was like 30 percent.

MS. KAGAN: I think it's 30 percent of the victims of hate crime require hospitalization, and only 7 percent of non-hate crimes require hospitalization. So these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent.

Q Will there be any focus at the conference on the increasing number of hate sites on the Internet?

MS. ECHAVESTE: I don't -- Richard --

MR. SOCARIDES: In the last break-out group --

MS. ECHAVESTE: I'm sorry, thank you for reminding me. One of the other workshops is combatting organized hate. That is, a workshop will be focused on groups that are organized around hate. And in that context, we should be discussing those things.

Q Why is this a federal issue, since criminal justice is basically a state and local issue?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we do have federal hate crimes laws, and so there is federal law in this area.

Q Criminal?

MS. ECHAVESTE: There is federal criminal law in this area.

Q Maria, pretty much we understand that the Race Advisory Board is trying to target more so youth as far as dealing with the racial issue. Are you going to, Monday, deal with more so youth-oriented issues with them, target youth as well?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, one of the participants on the President's panel is a sophomore in high school, a Filipino student who is part of an effort of the ADL's Children of Dreams program, who's working on peer training and to mediate tensions between groups. So there are young people involved in Monday's conference.

U.S. Newswire, November 07, 1997

Q Do the statistics reflect the strength of organized hate groups? Are groups like the Klan and neo-Nazi groups on the increase? Do these numbers show anything in that regard?

MS. KAGAN: The aggregate numbers that we have are not broken down like that, so it's hard to say how much of them are crimes of organized hate groups and how much are the crimes of often, as one person said, teenagers acting sort of alone or in gangs of some kind. The statistics just don't give any indication.

Q Anecdotally, do you know? Do some of the experts that you've consulted ahead of this conference tell you anything about the strength of the presence of hate groups in the country?

MS. KAGAN: There is, obviously, still too much activity by hate groups and too many crimes committed by them. Klan Watch documented 51 cases of cross burnings in the United States in 1996. That's maybe one indication of the kind of crimes committed by a particular hate group.

But this is one of the things that's going to be talked about in one of these break-out sessions, is how prevalent these organized groups are, what kind of crimes they're committing and what we ought to do to respond to their activity.

Q Could you tell us the names of the workshops, so that we know what - -

MS. ECHAVESTE: It's in the press advisory.

MR. LOCKHART: It will be available right after the briefing.

Q Would the Oklahoma City bombing qualify as a hate crime under your definitions?

MS. ECHAVESTE: No. Although it sort of represents how difficult it is to take on this issue. But because it -- we sort of -- that's domestic terrorism; it is focused on an issue, if you will, not against particular individuals, the characteristic of the individual as we saw in terms of the people who got hurt -- it crossed the lines of people who got hurt.

It's the same way that clinic violence would not -- although some groups have asked that it be considered a hate crime, it would not meet the strict definition.

Q Do you have statistics on hate crimes committed on college campuses?

MS. ECHAVESTE: No. In fact, one of the workshops will be about the need for data. And I think out of that we might find some suggestions in terms of what kind of data needs to be collected in order to be able -- like with any problem, you need the facts in order to devise strategies for combating and resolving those kinds of problems. So I think we might get some good suggestions.

Q Talking about the definition -- I'm still unclear -- these 8,759 reported last year, are they hate crimes as defined by the responsible particular law enforcement agency, that they felt was a --

MS. KAGAN: That's right. And often it depends on their own law and the

U.S. Newswire, November 07, 1997

definition of hate crimes in their own law, and that does vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. But for the most part, state laws look at the same thing, which is whether the attack or the other kind of crime was motivated by some kind of bias or animus against a characteristic of the victim -- whether that's sexual orientation, or race, or gender, or what have you.

Q What can we expect to see Monday? Are we going to see something like we saw with some of the Race Advisory Board meetings where you just have pretty much experts just talking, or do you have interactive --

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we have the -- as I described, we have -- over 350 people. There will be plenary session in which the President addresses them, and then the President moderates the panel of seven people that will be discussing the issue of hate crimes. Then they do breakout sessions and they'll be broken into 50 people per breakout. And then they'll be brought back together again. So there will be interaction among folks and then those discussion groups.

Any other questions?

Great. Thank you.

END 1:33 P.M. EST

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 7, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 112 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Federal Information Systems Corporation
Federal News Service

NOVEMBER 7, 1997, FRIDAY

SECTION: WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING

LENGTH: 2677 words

HEADLINE: SPECIAL WHITE HOUSE PRESS BRIEFING WITH
ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT AND
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC LIAISON MARIA ECHAVESTE AND
DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR
DOMESTIC POLICY ELENA KAGAN
WHITE HOUSE BRIEFING ROOM
RE: WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HATE CRIMES

BODY:

MR. LOCKHART: Good afternoon, everyone. Before Mike comes out for the regular daily briefing, we are joined by Maria Echaveste, who is the Director of the Office of Public Liaison; and Elena Kagan, the Deputy Director of the Domestic Policy Council. They're going to give us a little rundown of the White House Conference on Hate Crimes, which is scheduled for Monday, give you an outline of what we expect the agenda to be, who will be participating. And they'll be glad to take any questions you have. Thanks.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Good afternoon. Just some background, why we're having the White House Conference on Hate Crimes. As part of our outreach and soliciting input

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

on the President's Initiative on Race, one of the issues that people talked a lot to us about was the existence of hate crimes and what people perceive to be an increase in hate crimes, and this is an issue that we really decided to take a look at.

While a majority of hate crimes seem to be against people of color, there are hate crimes against people based on their beliefs, religious beliefs, sexual orientation. About six months ago the Attorney General put together a working group at the Department of Justice at the President's request to develop recommendations to tackle this problem.

So on Monday we will have this conference. It will be organized as follows. We have over 350 people coming from all over the country. A good portion are law enforcement, state and local officials -- because law enforcement is a very significant partner in trying to combat hate crimes.

We will start off with a breakfast here at the White House that will be closed to the press, and then we will move over to GW, at which point the President will start the conference by making some opening remarks, will be making some announcements. And then he will moderate a panel with seven other individuals that include: a principal from Mamaroneck, New York, who after a series of hate crimes in Mamaroneck, which is a suburb in Westchester County, he organized a community effort to combat; a woman from Montana, who was the subject of anti-Semitic hate crimes and who organized her community to have both Jews and non-Jews put menorahs in their windows to show the community's response against hate crimes.

Fundamentally, this is about being tough on hate crimes. We're drawing a line against hate. There should be no question anywhere around this country that we do not tolerate violence against a person because of what they look like, what they believe in, because of their sexual orientation. There should be a broad consensus, indeed unanimity, that violence against an individual because of an individual's characteristics is wrong.

And so there will be law enforcement and prevention announcements on Monday. After the President's remarks we will then have a series of workshops moderated by members of the Cabinet. We have full participation, beginning with the Attorney General and including people like Secretary Cuomo, Secretary Riley, Secretary Slater; breaking into workshops -- then that will be about an hour and a half -- and then we will have the Attorney General get a report back from each of the moderators in terms of what was discussed and possible actions after the conference.

So why don't I stop there and let Elena talk a little bit about some of the data or statistics and facts that we have regarding hate crimes.

MS. KAGAN: I'll give you a little bit of the data, but I'll warn you first that the data we have, the statistics we have are not all that meaningful, and that's principally because hate crimes, we have every reason to think, are dramatically under-reported. They're under-reported for two reasons: first, because victims themselves are often embarrassed about the crimes or hesitant for other reasons to report them; and second, because under the existing system communities report crimes to the Justice Department in order to get aggregate figures voluntarily. Not all communities do that. There has been a steady increase each year in the number of communities that participate in this reporting system, but we're not yet at a hundred percent, so the statistics that I will give you are almost surely under what is truly happening out there.

And it's also very difficult from these statistics to actually figure out what the trends are, whether there are more hate crimes each year, whether they're staying the same, or whether there are even fewer. The statistics, as you'll see, go up, but it's hard to know whether that's because incidents are

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

increasing or because the reporting is getting better.

But the total number of hate crimes in 1996, hate crime incidents reported, were 8,759. In 1995, it was 7,947. So there is an increase but, again, it's hard to know whether that's an increase in the actual incidents or just better reporting.

In terms of what kinds of crimes these are, the 1996 figures show that racial bias accounts for over 60 percent of the reported hate crimes, precisely 63.13. Religious bias accounts for 13.9 percent. Ethnicity, which is often crimes against people of Hispanic origin, count for 11 percent. And sexual orientation counts for about 12 percent of those crimes. That's a little bit about the statistics.

MS. ECHAVESTE: Questions?

Q Do you anticipate increased penalties for hate crimes as a result of this conference, recommended by the Attorney General?

MS. KAGAN: Well, we're going to have more to say about the announcements that we're going to make on Monday, and I don't want to say now what the President is going to call for, but the President is going to talk about law enforcement efforts, making sure that the laws we have on the book appropriately protect all our citizens and then making sure that those laws are enforced so that we're actually bringing the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. So I guess that's all I want to say about that now.

Q This question is for Maria. Maria, what groups -- what civil rights are going to be attending and what parts are they playing Monday in the workshops?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Did you say "civil rights groups"?

Q Yes.

MS. ECHAVESTE: The participants really -- it ranges everything from the usual organizations like ADL and National Council -- Leadership Conference. But we also try to get individuals from community organizations from around the country. And I do want to stress the law enforcement participation. This is a significant piece, because one of the things that we've learned is that people who have been the victims of hate crimes have in the past been reluctant to report their crimes to their local police, if it was a crime because of sexual orientation, feeling there would be a lack of sympathy, a lack of responsiveness. And we really want to hear from law enforcement officials who have developed their task forces or their community response in order to teach others on how to do it.

I think the important thing about a hate crime is not every act of violence is, in fact, a hate crime. And oftentimes you don't know that is in indeed a hate crime until you've finished your investigation, in order to understand the motivation. And so this makes it a little more difficult to investigate.

Q First of all, about the connection between the remarks the President is going to make tomorrow night and the conference on Monday. Do you have anything to say about that?

MS. ECHAVESTE: We announced the date of the conference in June and it just was fortuitous that we had accepted the HRC dinner a few months later.

Q The second thing is with regard to education or the educational community, so to speak. A lot of this goes on in schools or with students to other students and in many communities is simply treated as a law enforcement issue. The schools boards or the administrations don't want to get involved. So --

MS. ECHAVESTE: That's absolutely -- in fact we have two workshops: one on hate crimes in K through 12 -- just having that title makes you cringe a little bit to think that students will be harassing and possibly engaging in physical

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

attacks against fellow students when they're fairly young. We'll also have one on hate crimes on college campuses -- on campus -- because the education piece is very, very important.

Q Why did you decide to do this now? I mean, what -- can you explain the timing? Why didn't this happen four years ago?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, all I can tell you in terms of what we've been working on -- since I've gotten here at any rate -- as I said, the idea came about as we were exploring and getting options and input on the President's Initiative on Race. And a number of groups came to us and said, you know, there is this problem of hate crimes and it really needs some visibility and needs to be put on sort of center stage, and we want to encourage the White House to do it. And so in that context we thought a conference is a good way to do it and it can encompass a variety of different groups that are the subject of hate crimes.

Q What will you do with the information afterwards? What sort of follow-up will you have?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, I think a lot of it depends on the interactions and the suggestions that come out of the workshops. I think that you will see from the announcements on Monday that there will, indeed, be follow-up. This is a significant commitment.

Q How do you decide what a hate crime is? Why is it a hate crime when it's against somebody who's a different race, but not a hate crime if it's somebody who's a different gender, for instance?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, that's precisely what I was getting to. They're trying to determine the motivations. There are those who argue that there are gender-based hate crimes. Those would be, obviously, very difficult -- could be very difficult to investigate -- I think not every rape would qualify as a hate crime. On the other hand, there could be instances or -- not every act of violence against an African American by a white person is -- or a Latino is necessarily a hate crime.

What we hope to learn from our law enforcement folks who will be attending on Monday is -- one of the panels is law enforcement response to hate crime -- how do you go about determining what is a hate crime. And it has to do with motivation and the identity of the victim. If the victim's characteristic was what led to the crime, as opposed to other motivations for crime, it's more difficult.

I think one of the statistics that Elena had, had to do with the percentage of victims who are -- of hate crimes who require hospitalization versus those who are victims of other crimes. And I think it was like 30 percent.

MS. KAGAN: I think it's 30 percent of the victims of hate crime require hospitalization, and only 7 percent of non-hate crimes require hospitalization. So these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent.

Q Will there be any focus at the conference on the increasing number of hate sites on the Internet?

MS. ECHAVESTE: I don't -- Richard --

MR. SOCARIDES: In the last break-out group --

MS. ECHAVESTE: I'm sorry, thank you for reminding me. One of the other workshops is combatting organized hate. That is, a workshop will be focused on groups that are organized around hate. And in that context, we should be discussing those things.

Q Why is this a federal issue, since criminal justice is basically a state and local issue?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we do have federal hate crimes laws, and so there is federal law in this area.

Q Criminal?

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

MS. ECHAVESTE: There is federal criminal law in this area.

Q Maria, pretty much we understand that the Race Advisory Board is trying to target more so youth as far as dealing with the racial issue. Are you going to, Monday, deal with more so youth-oriented issues with them, target youth as well?

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, one of the participants on the President's panel is a sophomore in high school, a Filipino student who is part of an effort of the ADL's Children of Dreams program, who's working on peer training and to mediate tensions between groups. So there are young people involved in Monday's conference.

Q Do the statistics reflect the strength of organized hate groups? Are groups like the Klan and neo-Nazi groups on the increase? Do these numbers show anything in that regard?

MS. KAGAN: The aggregate numbers that we have are not broken down like that, so it's hard to say how much of them are crimes of organized hate groups and how much are the crimes of often, as one person said, teenagers acting sort of alone or in gangs of some kind. The statistics just don't give any indication.

Q Anecdotally, do you know? Do some of the experts that you've consulted ahead of this conference tell you anything about the strength of the presence of hate groups in the country?

MS. KAGAN: There is, obviously, still too much activity by hate groups and too many crimes committed by them. Klan Watch documented 51 cases of cross burnings in the United States in 1996. That's maybe one indication of the kind of crimes committed by a particular hate group.

But this is one of the things that's going to be talked about in one of these break-out sessions, is how prevalent these organized groups are, what kind of crimes they're committing and what we ought to do to respond to their activity.

Q Could you tell us the names of the workshops, so that we know what --

MS. ECHAVESTE: It's in the press advisory.

MR. LOCKHART: It will be available right after the briefing.

Q Would the Oklahoma City bombing qualify as a hate crime under your definitions?

MS. ECHAVESTE: No. Although it sort of represents how difficult it is to take on this issue. But because it -- we sort of -- that's domestic terrorism; it is focused on an issue, if you will, not against particular individuals, the characteristic of the individual as we saw in terms of the people who got hurt -- it crossed the lines of people who got hurt.

It's the same way that clinic violence would not -- although some groups have asked that it be considered a hate crime, it would not meet the strict definition.

Q Do you have statistics on hate crimes committed on college campuses? MS.

ECHAVESTE: No. In fact, one of the workshops will be about the need for data. And I think out of that we might find some suggestions in terms of what kind of data needs to be collected in order to be able -- like with any problem, you need the facts in order to devise strategies for combating and resolving those kinds of problems. So I think we might get some good suggestions.

Q Talking about the definition -- I'm still unclear -- these 8,759 reported last year, are they hate crimes as defined by the responsible particular law enforcement agency, that they felt was a --

MS. KAGAN: That's right. And often it depends on their own law and the definition of hate crimes in their own law, and that does vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. But for the most part, state laws look at the same thing, which is whether the attack or the other kind of crime was motivated by some kind of bias or animus against a characteristic of the victim -- whether

Federal News Service, NOVEMBER 7, 1997

that's sexual orientation, or race, or gender, or what have you.

Q What can we expect to see Monday? Are we going to see something like we saw with some of the Race Advisory Board meetings where you just have pretty much experts just talking, or do you have interactive --

MS. ECHAVESTE: Well, we have the -- as I described, we have -- over 350 people. There will be plenary session in which the President addresses them, and then the President moderates the panel of seven people that will be discussing the issue of hate crimes. Then they do breakout sessions and they'll be broken into 50 people per breakout. And then they'll be brought back together again. So there will be interaction among folks and then those discussion groups.

Any other questions?

Great. Thank you.

END

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 8, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 113 OF 166 STORIES

Public Papers of the Presidents

November 7, 1997

CITE: 33 Weekly Comp. Pres. Doc. 1752

LENGTH: 402 words

HEADLINE: Checklist of White House Press Releases

HIGHLIGHT:

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

BODY:

Released November 1

Transcript of a radio address by Vice President Al Gore

Announcement of the President's letter to the Governors of the 36 States that have not yet begun to participate in the national registry of sex offenders established at the Justice Department under a 1996 directive by the President

Released November 3

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: President Clinton's Participation in APEC Leaders Meeting

Released November 4

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry: Sudan: Declaration of Emergency and Imposition of Sanctions

Released November 5

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman, Secretary of Commerce Bill Daley, and National Economic Council Director Gene Sperling on the President's balanced budget proposals

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of Prime Minister Mesut Yilmaz of Turkey

Released November 6

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of remarks by President George Bush, President Jimmy Carter, President Gerald Ford, and Mrs. Nancy Reagan at the George Bush Presidential Library dedication ceremony in College Station, TX

Transcript of remarks by Vice President Al Gore on fast-track trade legislation

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the upcoming visit of President Alpha Oumar Konare of Mali

Announcement of nomination for two U.S. Court of Appeals Judges for the Second Circuit and a Judge for the U.S. Court of Federal Claims

Released November 7

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Public Liaison Maria Echaveste and Deputy Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy Elena Kagan on the upcoming White House Conference on Hate Crimes

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Arkansas

Statement by White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles on efforts to resolve all matters in the remaining appropriations bills

Announcement of nomination for U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: December 15, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 114 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.
FDCH Political Transcripts

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

November 7, 1997, Friday

TYPE: NEWS BRIEFING

LENGTH: 2956 words

HEADLINE: HOLDS BRIEFING TO DISCUSS THE UPCOMING WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON HATE
CRIMES; WASHINGTON, D.C.

SPEAKER:

MARIA ECHAVESTE, WHITE HOUSE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC LIAISON

BODY:

WHITE HOUSE OFFICIALS HOLD BRIEFING ON CONFERENCE ON HATE

CRIMES

NOVEMBER 7, 1997

*** Elapsed Time 00:00, Eastern Time 13:10 ***

SPEAKERS: ELENA KAGAN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

FOR DOMESTIC POLICY

MARIA ECHAVESTE, WHITE HOUSE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC LIAISON

*

(UNKNOWN): Good afternoon everyone. Before Mike comes out for the regular daily briefing, we are joined by Maria Echaveste who is the director of Office of Public Liaison and Elena Kagan, the deputy director of the Domestic Policy Council. They're going to give us a little run down of the White House conference on hate crimes which is scheduled for Monday -- give you an outline of what we expect the agenda to be, who will be participating and they'll be glad to take any questions you have.

Thanks.

ECHAVESTE: Good afternoon. Just some background why we're having the White House conference on hate crimes. As part of our outreach on soliciting input on the president's initiative on race, one of the issues that people talked a lot to us about was the existence of hate crimes and what perceived to be an increase in hate crimes. And this is an issue that we really have decided to take a look at. While a majority of hate crimes seem to be against people of color, there are hate crimes against people based on their beliefs, religious beliefs, sexual orientation.

*** Elapsed Time 00:01, Eastern Time 13:11 ***

And about six months ago, the attorney general put together a working group at the Department of Justice at the president's request to develop recommendations to tackle this problem. And son on Monday we will have this

conference. It'll be organized as follows:

We have about over 350 people coming from all over the country. A good portion are law enforcement -- state, local officials -- because law enforcement is a very significant partner in trying to combat hate crimes.

We will start off with a breakfast there at the White House that'll be closed to the press. And then we will move over to GW, at which point the president will start the conference by making some opening remarks. We'll be making some announcements. And then he will moderate a panel with seven other individuals that include a principal from Mamaroneck, New York who, after a series of hate crimes in Mamaroneck, which is a suburb in West Chester County, he organized a community effort to combat; a woman from Montana who was the subject of anti-Semitic hate crimes and who organized her community to have both Jews and non-Jews put menorahs in their windows to show the community's response against hate crimes.

ECHAVESTE: Fundamentally, this is about being tough on hate crimes. We're drawing the line against hate. There should be no question anywhere around this country that we do not tolerate violence against a person because of what they look like, what they believe in, because of their sexual orientation. There should be a broad consensus, indeed unanimity, that violence against an individual because of an individual's characteristics is wrong.

*** Elapsed Time 00:03, Eastern Time 13:13 ***

And so, there will be law enforcement and prevention announcements on Monday. After the president's remarks, we will then have a series of workshops moderated by members of the cabinet. We have full participation with, beginning with the attorney general, and including people like Secretary Cuomo, Secretary Riley, Secretary Slater, breaking into workshops. And then -- that will be about an hour-and-a-half -- and then we will have the attorney general get a report back from each of the moderators in terms of what was discussed and possible actions after the conference. So why don't I stop there and let Elena talk a little bit about some of the data or statistics and facts that we have regarding hate crimes.

*** Elapsed Time 00:04, Eastern Time 13:14 ***

KAGAN: I'll give you a little bit of the data, but I'll warn you first that the data we have, the statistics we have are not all that meaningful, and that's principally because hate crimes, we have ever reason to think, are dramatically underreported.

KAGAN: They're underreported for two reasons. First, because victims themselves are often embarrassed about the crimes or hesitant for other reasons to report them. And second, because, under the existing system communities report crimes to the Justice Department in order to get advocate figures voluntarily. Not all communities do that.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

There has been a steady increase each year in the number of communities that participate in this reporting system. But, we're not yet at 100 percent. So, the statistics that I will give you are almost surely under what is truly happening out there. And it's also very difficult from these statistics to actually figure out what the trends are.

Whether there are more hate crimes each year, or whether they're staying the same or whether there are even fewer. The statistics, as you'll see, go up, but it's hard to know whether that's because incidents are increasing or because the reporting is getting better.

*** Elapsed Time 00:05, Eastern Time 13:15 ***

But, the total number of hate crimes in 1996, hate crime incidents reported -- were 8,759. In 1995 it was 7,947. So there is an increase, but again, it's hard to know whether that's increase in the actual incidents or just better reporting.

In terms of what kinds of crimes these are, the 1996 figures show that racial bias accounts for over 60 percent of the reported hate crimes. Precisely, 63.13. Religious bias accounts for 13.9 percent. Ethnicity, which is often crimes against people of Hispanic origin, count for 11 percent. And sexual orientation counts for about 12 percent of those crimes.

*** Elapsed Time 00:06, Eastern Time 13:16 ***

That's a little bit about the statistics.

ECHAVESTE: Questions?

QUESTION: Do you anticipate increased penalties for hate crimes as a result of these conferences recommended by the Attorney General?

KAGAN: I'm sorry?

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) increased criminal penalties for a hate crime?

KAGAN: Well, we're going to have more to say about the announcements that we're going to make on Monday and I don't want to say now what the President is going to call for.

KAGAN: But the President is going to talk about law enforcement efforts, making sure that the laws we have on the book appropriately protect all our citizens. And then, making sure that those laws are enforced so we're actually bringing the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. So, I guess that's all I want to say about that now.

QUESTION: This question's for Maria. Maria, what groups are -- which civil rights groups are going to be attending and what parts are they playing Monday in the workshops.

ECHAVESTE: Did you say civil rights groups?

*** Elapsed Time 00:07, Eastern Time 13:17 ***

The participants really -- it ranges everything from, you know, the usual organizations like ADL and National Council (OFF-MIKE) leadership conference. But we also try to get individuals from community organizations from around around the Country. And I do want to stress the law enforcement participation.

This is a significant piece because one of the things that we've learned is that people who have been the victims of hate crimes have in the past been reluctant to report their crimes to their local police, if it was a crime because of sexual orientation, feeling there would be a lack of sympathy, a lack of responsiveness. And we really want to hear from law enforcement officials who have developed their task forces or their community response in order to teach others on how to do it.

And I think the important thing about a hate crime is -- not every act of violence is in fact, a hate crime.

*** Elapsed Time 00:08, Eastern Time 13:18 ***

And often times you don't know that is indeed a hate crime until you've finished your investigation in it in order to understand the motivation. And so, this makes it a little more difficult to investigate. Yes, sir.

QUESTION: First of all, about the connection between the remarks the president is going to make tomorrow night and the conference on Monday, do you have anything to say about that?

ECHAVESTE: We announced the date of the Conference in June and it just was fortuitous that we accepted the HRC dinner a few months later.

QUESTION: And the second thing is in regard to education or the educational community, so to speak, a lot of this goes on in schools or with students to other students and in many communities, its simply treated as a law enforcement issue. The School Boards or the Administrations don't want to get involve.

*** Elapsed Time 00:09, Eastern Time 13:19 ***

ECHAVESTE: That's absolutely -- in fact, we have two workshops, one on hate crimes in K-12. You know, just having that title makes you sort of cringe a little bit to think that students will be harassing and possibly engaging in physical attacks against fellow students when they're fairly young.

We'll also have one on hate crimes on college campuses, on campus. Because the education pieces is very, very important.

QUESTION: Why did you decide to this now. Can you explain the timing? Why didn't this happen four years ago?

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

ECHAVESTE: Well, all I can tell you in terms of what we've been working on since I've gotten here, at any rate, was -- as I said, the idea came about as we were exploring and getting options and input on the President's initiative on race and a number of groups came to us and said -- you know, there is this problem of hate crimes and we really need some visibility, it needs to be put on sort of center stage and we want to encourage the White House to do it.

And so, in that context we thought a conference is a good way to do it, and it can encompass a variety of different groups that are the subject of hate crimes.

*** Elapsed Time 00:10, Eastern Time 13:20 ***

QUESTION: What will you do with the information afterwards. What sort of follow-up will you have?

ECHAVESTE: Well, I think a lot of it depends on the interactions and the suggestions that come out of the workshops. I think that you will see from the announcements on Monday that there will indeed be follow up. This is a significant commitment.

QUESTION: How do you decide what a hate crime is? Why is it a hate crime when its against somebody who's a different race, but not a hate crime, if its somebody from a different gender, for instance.

ECHAVESTE: Well, that's precisely what I was getting to, that trying to determine the motivations. There are those who argue that are gender-based hate crimes. Those would be obviously, very difficult, could be very difficult to investigate, I think, not every rape would qualify as a hate crime.

*** Elapsed Time 00:11, Eastern Time 13:21 ***

On the other hand, there could be instances or not every act of violence against an African American by a white person, or a Latino, is necessarily a hate crime, it really -- what we hope to learn from our law enforcement folks who will be attending on Monday -- when a panel says law enforcement response to your hate crime? How do you go about determining what is a hate crime?

And it has to do with motivation and what the identity of the victim. If the victim's characteristic is what lead to the crime, as opposed to other motivations for crime, it's more difficult. I think one of the statistics that Elena had, had to do with the percentage of victims who are of hate crimes who require hospitalization versus those who are victims of other crimes. And I think it was like can -- 30 percent?

KAGAN: I think it's 30 percent of victims of hate crimes require hospitalization and only seven percent of non-hate crimes require hospitalization. So, these crimes do tend to be serious and often violent.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

*** Elapsed Time 00:12, Eastern Time 13:22 ***

QUESTION: Will there be any focus at the conference on the increasing number of hate sites on the Internet?

(UNKNOWN): In the last breakup group on the --

ECHAVESTE: Yes. And, I'm sorry, thank you for reminding me. There is -- one of the other workshops is combating organized hate. That is, a workshop will be focused around groups what organized around hate. And in that context we should be discussing those things.

QUESTION: Maria, why is this a federal issue, since criminal justice is basically state and local issue.

ECHAVESTE: Well, we do have federal hate crimes laws. So, there is federal law in this area. There's federal criminal law in this area. April?

QUESTION: Maria, pretty much the rape advisory board is trying to target more so (OFF-MIKE) as far as dealing with the racial issue. Are you going to one day deal with more so youth oriented issues with them targeting these as well?

*** Elapsed Time 00:13, Eastern Time 13:23 ***

ECHAVESTE: Well, one of the participants on the President's panel is a sophomore in high school, a Filipino student who is part of an effort of the ADL's Children of Dreams Program, and who's working on peer training to mediate tensions between groups. So, there are young people involved in Monday's conference. Yes.

QUESTION: Do the statistics reflect the strength of organized hate groups, are groups like the Alan and neo Nazi groups on the increase. Do these numbers show anything in that regard.

KAGAN: The aggregate numbers that we have are not broken down like that, so its hard to say how much of them are crimes of organized hate groups and how much are the crimes of often as one person said, teenagers acting sort of in -- alone or in gangs of some kind.

*** Elapsed Time 00:14, Eastern Time 13:24 ***

So, the statistics just don't give any indication of that.

QUESTION: (OFF-MIKE) do you know? Do some of the experts that you've consulted ahead of this conference tell you anything about the presence, the strength or the presence of hate groups in this Country?

KAGAN: There is obviously still too much activity by hate groups and too many crimes committed by them. Klanwatch documented 51 cases of cross burnings in

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

the United States in 1996. That's maybe one indication of the kind of crimes committed by a particular hate group.

But, this is one of the things that's going to be talked about in one of these break out sessions, is, how prevalent these organized groups are, what kind of crimes are they committing, and what we ought to do to respond to their activity.

*** Elapsed Time 00:15, Eastern Time 13:25 ***

QUESTION: What were the names of the workshops so that we know.

ECHAVESTE: Its in the press advisory.

(UNKNOWN): It will be available right after the briefing.

QUESTION: Would the Oklahoma City bombing qualify as a hate crime under your definition?

ECHAVESTE: Uh, no. Although, it sort of represents how difficult it is to take on this issue. But, because -- that's domestic terrorism. It is focused on issue, if you will, not against particular individuals, the characteristic of the individual as we saw, in terms of the people who got hurt, it crossed the lines of people who got hurt.

It's the same way that clinic violence would not, although some groups have asked that it be considered a hate crime. It would not meet the strict definition.

QUESTION: Are hate crimes committed on college campuses?

*** Elapsed Time 00:16, Eastern Time 13:26 ***

ECHAVESTE: No, no. In fact, one of the workshops will be about the need for data, and I think, out of that we might find some suggestions in terms, what kind of data needs to be collected in order to be able -- like with any problem you need the facts in order to devise strategies for combating and resolving those kinds of problems. So, I think we might get some good suggestions.

QUESTION: In talking about the definition. I'm still unclear. There's 8,759 (OFF-MIKE) committed last year. Are they hate crimes as defined by the responsible -- particular law enforcement agency? They felt was the --

KAGAN: That's right. And often it depends on their own law and the definition of hate crimes in their own law. And that does vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

But, for the most part, state laws look at the same thing, which is, why the attack or the other kind of crime was motivated by some kind of bias or animus against a characteristic of the victim.

FDCH Political Transcripts, November 7, 1997

*** Elapsed Time 00:17, Eastern Time 13:27 ***

Whether that's sexual orientation or race or gender or what have you.

QUESTION: What can we expect to see Monday. Are we going to see something like we saw with some of the race advisory board meetings or just have pretty much experts just talking or do you have interactive with (OFF-MIKE)?

ECHAVESTE: As I've described, we have over 350 people. There will be a plenary session in which the President addresses them and then the President moderates the panel of seven people that will be discussing the issue of hate crimes. Then they do brake-out sessions, and they'll be broken into 50 people per brake out. And then, they'll be brought back together again. So, there'll be interaction among folks and in those discussion groups. So,

*** Elapsed Time 00:18, Eastern Time 13:28 ***

Any other question? Great.

END

NOTES:

???? - Indicates Speaker Unknown

- Could not make out what was being said.

off mike - Indicates Could not make out what was being said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: November 8, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 115 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.
FDCH Political Transcripts

September 17, 1997, Wednesday

TYPE: NEWS EVENT

LENGTH: 880 words

HEADLINE: DELIVERS REMARKS ON THE TOBACCO SETTLEMENT; WASHINGTON, D.C.

SPEAKER:

ALBERT GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

BODY:

VICE PRESIDENT ALBERT GORE DELIVERS REMARKS ON THE
TOBACCO SETTLEMENT

FDCH Political Transcripts, September 17, 1997

SEPTEMBER 17, 1997

SPEAKERS: ALBERT GORE, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

*

GORE: Ladies and Gentlemen, on behalf of the president, it's my pleasure to welcome you here. And on his behalf, let me acknowledge the distinguished guests, at least some of them, who are joining us here today -- members of the president's Cabinet, Secretary Donna Shalala of HHS and Secretary Dan Glickman of the Agriculture Department, and Erskine Bowles, the president's chief of staff.

We're joined also by Bruce Reed assistant to the president for domestic policy, who has been a co-head of this review process along with Secretary Donna Shalala. There are too many others on the president's team who are here to acknowledge all of them. But I would like to acknowledge Bruce Lindsey and Elena Kagan, two of the many people who have worked very hard in reviewing this matter.

We're very honored to be joined by the distinguished attorneys general from various states who are present here who have played a magnificent role in moving this national dialogue forward -- Attorney General Michael Moore of Mississippi; Attorney General Skip Humphrey of Minnesota; Attorney General Christine Gregoire of Washington; Attorney General Bob Butterworth of Florida; Attorney General Grant Woods of Arizona.

Of course, as you see, we're joined by Dr. C. Everett Koop and Dr. David Kessler, former surgeon general and former FDA director respectively. We appreciate their wonderful help. And also Dr. John Sefrin, CEO of the American Cancer Society; Dr. Dudley Hafner, executive VP of the American Heart Association; Dr. Randolph Smoak, vice chair of the board of the American Medical Association; and Matt Myers, executive vice president and general counsel of the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids, and as you know, someone who has been especially active in working on this matter.

And we're very pleased to be joined by Senator Robert Bennett of Utah and Senator Kent Conrad of North Dakota, as well as Congressman Mike Castle, Congressman Marty Meehan and Congressman Henry Waxman. And all five of these gentlemen have been extremely active on this issue.

Let me say, for my own part, being able to work with President Clinton these last four-and-a-half years has given me a lot to feel proud about -- all the economic progress; all the improvements in crime, welfare, teen pregnancy; a renewed sense of leadership in the world.

GORE: But I can honestly say that there is nothing that has been done in this White House over the past four-and-a-half years that has made me prouder of this president than what he has done in providing unprecedented and historic leadership in completely changing our nation's dialogue about the number one leading cause of preventable death and disease in the United States today. It's not an accident that no other president has ever stepped up to the plate to this issue, even though an astonishing 22 percent of all 17- and 18-year-olds in this nation smoke cigarettes.

FDCH Political Transcripts, September 17, 1997

We know from work by the health researchers that if children don't start smoking by the time they turn 19, they are unlikely to ever start. But once they do start, and especially if they start in their early teens, it's very hard for them to ever stop. In fact, almost a little more than 70 percent of adults who are smokers right now desperately want to quit smoking, but find that they cannot.

And of the 3,000 teenagers a day who still start smoking every day, nearly 1,000 of them will have their lives cut short by tobacco. At its heart, this is not just a policy issue. It is a family issue. And there are millions of us who know how smoking can affect a family. And I know that with more of America's children being raised by working parents, there is more need than ever for families to get some help in protecting their children from destructive influences.

President Clinton stood up to all of the special interests who have been fighting hard to keep things as they are and stop change. He said it was time for tobacco companies to draw the line at our children. He put in place the toughest ever measures to cut off children's access to tobacco. He's fighting for the toughest ever restrictions on tobacco advertising aimed at children. His leadership forced tobacco companies to come to the bargaining table. And that's why we're even talking about a settlement in the first place.

The settlement that was reached in June was a historic moment in a decade's long struggle. But the work goes on. And with today's announcement, President Clinton is making it clear that when it comes to protecting our children from addiction and from disease, we cannot settle for half a loaf.

We can pass the right kind of legislation to protect children from smoking, and President Clinton is leading the way there.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I said before how proud his leadership has made me. I know that there are millions of other Americans who join in that feeling. It truly is an honor to present the leader of our nation's fight in this struggle, the president of the United States, Bill Clinton.

MORE

NOTES:

???? - Indicates Speaker Unknown
- Could not make out what was being said.
off mike - Indicates Could not make out what was being said.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: September 17, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 116 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 The Durham Herald Co.
The Herald-Sun (Durham, N.C.)

The Herald-Sun (Durham, N.C.), August 12, 1997

August 12, 1997, Tuesday

SECTION: Front; Pg. A1;

LENGTH: 726 words

HEADLINE: Clinton to pitch companies to hire from welfare rolls

BYLINE: JODI ENDA Knight-Ridder

BODY:

WASHINGTON -- Working against a history littered with failure, President Clinton is campaigning to erase the stigma of the "welfare queen" and goad businesses to hire workers off the public-assistance rolls.

Experience would indicate he's tilting at windmills. In years past, many private companies have been reluctant to pull people from the bottom rungs of the economic ladder.

But the president knows that if he bows to history, welfare reform -- one of the hallmarks of his administration -- will flop.

So today in St. Louis, nearly one year after he signed a law intended to "end welfare as we know it," Clinton will attempt to change the national image of welfare recipients, to encourage employers to view them not as public burdens, but as untapped resources.

With the help of new radio and newspaper public-service announcements, he will try to debunk the notion of the lazy "queen" who chooses to live on the dole, replacing her with someone temporarily down on her luck, but eager and able to work.

"This is an emerging new workforce," said Eli Segal, president of the Welfare to Work Partnership, a private organization created by businesses to help move welfare recipients into jobs. The group is sponsoring the new public-service ads. Removing the stigma of welfare, Segal hopes, "will have the effect of actually changing the entry-level hiring practices of many companies in the United States."

That hasn't happened in the past. Despite a number of reform efforts, despite job-training programs and tax incentives for employers, companies never signed on to a full-scale effort to put welfare recipients to work.

But even skeptics of the welfare-to-work effort and opponents of the new law say the time for progress is now.

"There are a couple of things that are different this time. One is that the economy is so good," said Demetra Smith Nightingale, director of the Welfare and Training Research Program at the Urban Institute, a Washington think tank. "The other thing that is different is that the president has taken it upon himself to use the bully pulpit to call the country forward to help on this. That political leadership, I think, is important because it's being combined with business leadership. The priority is clear."

The Herald-Sun (Durham, N.C.), August 12, 1997

So is the need to work, said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy. Unlike efforts of the past three decades, she said the new law offers a "carrot and a stick" -- opportunities for recipients to find and learn new jobs combined with a very real threat that benefits will be cut off if they don't.

Furthermore, unemployment is so low in some parts of the country that employers have nowhere else to turn but the welfare rolls, experts said.

"Firms are having trouble finding the kind of employees that they really want, so they are willing to hire people that they otherwise would not," said Harry Holzer, an economics professor at Michigan State University. But, he added, "Nobody expects that to last very long."

The St. Louis event will be the first of several challenges to individual cities and regions to link their businesses with their job-training facilities, child-care centers and transportation systems to help welfare recipients find, get to and keep jobs, Segal said. About 500 businesses nationwide have pledged to participate since his nonprofit group organized in May, he said, though they have not specified how many welfare recipients they will hire.

First in St. Louis and then across the country, a computer database will be created so that companies that want to hire welfare recipients can locate assistance in the form of training programs, day-care facilities or mentors -- other businesses that have transcended the problems that often come with inexperienced workers.

Still, few expect the effort to be a panacea.

"Even if business leaders say, 'Yes, we're going to do this,' when it gets down to the nitty gritty, whether they actually will do it is debatable," said Kent Weaver of the Brookings Institution, another Washington think tank.

The Clinton administration is looking to the private sector to hire 2 million welfare recipients by 2000, enough to move more than half the nearly 4 million adults on welfare this spring. So far, companies pledging to participate represent only a drop in the bucket.

LOAD-DATE: August 12, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 117 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Phoenix Newspapers, Inc.
THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC

August 11, 1997 Monday, Final Chaser

SECTION: FRONT; Pg. A5

LENGTH: 552 words

HEADLINE: CLINTON TO DEBUNK STIGMA OF WELFARE;
WILL TRY TO CHANGE IMAGE OF LAZY 'QUEEN'

THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, August 11, 1997

BYLINE: By Jodi Enda, Knight-Ridder Newspapers

DATELINE: WASHINGTON

BODY:

Working against a history littered with failure, President Clinton is campaigning to erase the stigma of the "welfare queen" and goad businesses to hire workers off the public-assistance rolls.

In years past, many private companies have been reluctant to pull people from the bottom rungs of the economic ladder.

So Tuesday morning in St. Louis, nearly one year after he signed a law intended to "end welfare as we know it," Clinton will attempt to change the national image of welfare recipients, to encourage employers to view them not as public burdens, but as untapped resources.

With the help of new radio and newspaper public-service announcements he will try to debunk the notion of the lazy "queen" who chooses to live on the dole, replacing her with someone who is temporarily down on her luck, but eager and able to work.

"This is an emerging new workforce," said Eli Segal, president of the Welfare to Work Partnership, a private organization created by businesses to help move welfare recipients into jobs. The group is sponsoring the new public-service ads.

Removing the stigma of welfare, Segal hopes, "will have the effect of actually changing the entry-level hiring practices of many companies in the United States."

That hasn't happened in the past. Despite a number of reform efforts, despite job-training programs and tax incentives for employers, companies never signed on to a full-scale effort to put welfare recipients to work.

But even skeptics of the welfare-to-work effort and opponents of the new law say if ever the time is ripe for progress, it is now.

"There are a couple of things that are different this time. One is that the economy is so good," said Demetra Smith Nightingale, director of the Welfare and Training Research Program at the Urban Institute, a Washington think tank.

"The other thing that is different is that the president has taken it upon himself to use the bully pulpit to call the country forward to help on this. That political leadership, I think, is important because it's being combined with business leadership. The priority is clear."

So is the need to work, said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy. Unlike efforts of the past three decades, she said the new law offers a "carrot and a stick" - opportunities for recipients to find and learn new jobs combined with a very real threat that benefits will be cut off if they don't.

Furthermore, unemployment is so low in some parts of the country that employers have nowhere else to turn but the welfare rolls, experts said.

THE ARIZONA REPUBLIC, August 11, 1997

"Firms are having trouble finding the kind of employees that they really want, so they are willing to hire people that they otherwise would not," said Harry Holzer, an economics professor at Michigan State University. But, he added, "Nobody expects that to last very long."

The St. Louis event will be the first of several challenges to individual cities and regions to link their businesses with their job-training facilities, child-care centers and transportation systems to help welfare recipients find, get to and keep jobs, Segal said.

About 500 businesses nationwide have pledged to participate since his nonprofit group organized in May, he said, though they have not specified how many welfare recipients they will hire.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 13, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 118 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 The National Journal, Inc.
The National Journal

August 2, 1997

SECTION: THE ADMINISTRATION; Pg. 1566; Vol. 29, No. 31

LENGTH: 2614 words

HEADLINE: Still a Guy's Game

BYLINE: Alexis Simendinger

BODY:

Five years into an Administration sculpted to "look like America"--where more women have been appointed to senior agency and department posts than at any other time in history--the only woman in Bill Clinton's closest circle of White House advisers is Hillary Rodham Clinton.

The phrase "all the President's men," which was used to describe Richard M. Nixon's team a quarter-century ago, still applies today. At the top of Clinton's male pyramid are Vice President Al Gore and the President's chief of staff, North Carolinian Erskine B. Bowles, the third man to hold the job. The President's senior policy adviser is Rahm Emanuel, who took over where George R. Stephanopoulos left off. Clinton's ever-present aide-de-camp is Arkansas friend and deputy counsel Bruce R. Lindsey. And the President's chief economic adviser is Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin.

Ask any woman among the 39 per cent of the White House staff who are female why they think Clinton--a President who

The National Journal, August 2, 1997

preaches diversity and claims to practice it--has not done more to shatter the historical barrier around the Oval Office, and they will tell you they are baffled. Some will offer vague explanations about his comfort level with men and women's newly minted portfolios. And after a brief pause, they will defensively tick off a list of publicly obscure women at the White House whose titles put them just outside the prized circle.

"It is still mostly men," concedes White House communications director Ann F. Lewis in an interview, "but there are quite a few women. This President has made two lifetime choices. The first time, he chose Hillary Rodham. The second time, he chose Al Gore. He's a secure guy who chooses people who are smart and articulate and bring ideas and energy, and that's what he wants in the people he's going to spend most of his time with."

Lewis, an unabashed feminist who has spruced up her windowless West Wing office with artwork celebrating groundbreaking women, includes herself among a small number of women making inroads at the White House. There are only seven women who hold the prized title of assistant to the President, and Lewis is one of them. In contrast, there are 17 men with the title, and two others with the more senior rank of "counselor" to Clinton. Lewis, who was deputy campaign manager handling communications for Clinton-Gore '96 and a former political director for the Democratic National Committee, is surrounded by five male advisers to the President who have overlapping responsibilities within her shop.

The group includes outgoing communications director Donald A. Baer, who is leaving to undertake a variety of private-sector media projects; newly promoted chief speechwriter Michael A. Waldman; journalist-turned-Big Thinker Sidney Blumenthal, who arrives this month; Paul Begala, who managed Clinton's 1992 campaign with James Carville, and will soon become a salaried government employee; and senior adviser Emanuel, who likes to keep his hands in the message department. "Yes, isn't this interesting?" Lewis said, when asked about the crowd of Y chromosomes around her. "It's going to be a challenge."

Although titles at the White House do not always indicate who has real influence, they suggest who has authority. These days, the woman other than Mrs. Clinton who gets the most prominent attention is 32-year-old deputy chief of staff Sylvia A. Mathews, who is one of Bowles's two deputies. Mathews, a former Rhodes scholar who was Rubin's chief of staff before Bowles stole her away in December, manages many White House operations and is one of just four or five women who attend the Wednesday evening political meetings with Clinton in the White House residence. Her sharp instincts and judgment about a wide variety of issues are tapped by her bosses as well as by her colleagues. The youthful Mathews is only the second woman to hold the deputy chief of staff's job in the Clinton White House; the first, in 1996, was Evelyn S. Lieberman, 53, a former deputy to

The National Journal, August 2, 1997

White House spokesman Michael D. McCurry and former assistant to Hillary Clinton, who left the deputy job after a year at the White House to head the Voice of America.

Also mentioned as important among the ranks of the women is Janet L. Yellen, 50, chairwoman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Yellen, whose no-nonsense rhetoric is delivered with a pronounced Brooklyn accent, joined the White House a mere five months ago, after serving for three years as a Clinton appointee to the Federal Reserve Board. Yellen came to the White House as the budget battles were ending, so she had a less central role on the President's economic team than her peers, although the chief of staff made sure she was included in all the decisions. Yellen, who resurrected the weekly economic briefings for the President that had been dropped during last year's campaign, is seen as an important adviser because of her knowledge of economics and her familiarity with the thinking of Fed chairman Alan Greenspan. Even though economic policy has traditionally been a male preserve, two other women economists preceded Yellen in the Administration: former budget director Alice M. Rivlin (now at the Fed) and Laura D'Andrea Tyson, who was the first female Council of Economic Advisers chair in 1993. Tyson, who had real clout in the first term, took over Clinton's National Economic Council (NEC) when Rubin went to Treasury, but left Washington last year to return to teaching.

Another assistant to the President who is getting good marks is Maria Echaveste, 43, who directs public liaison. Her office functions as the President's eyes and ears to outside interest groups and "real people." Echaveste, a former corporate litigator who came to the West Wing in the second term from the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division, is in a position of considerable political importance to the President and Gore. She succeeded Alexis Herman, now Labor Secretary. Inside the White House, Herman was seen as a politically savvy aide with a vast network of contacts and connections. The President, in particular, relied heavily on her political weather vane. Echaveste's colleagues think she is successfully picking up where her predecessor left off.

Cheryl D. Mills, deputy counsel to the President, is applauded by many current and former White House officials for her mastery of a range of thorny issues in the counsel's office--everything from ethics requirements to the handling of Clintons' "scandals." While some commend the confident, and confidential, way she dispenses advice, others suggest that she sometimes shoots from the hip. The fast-talking, high-energy Mills, 32, is a skillful navigator, having served with all five of Clinton's top lawyers. She came to the White House during the 1992 transition, when she was a deputy general counsel working with the late Vincent Foster Jr. The continuity of her service adds to her influence.

Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the President for domestic policy, works side by side--some in the White House say

The National Journal, August 2, 1997

interchangeably--with boss Bruce Reed, who is considered to be Clinton's "centrist" conscience on the White House staff. Kagan, 35, shepherds issues ranging from tobacco to welfare through the policy pipeline. On extended leave from the University of Chicago, where she is a law professor, she specializes in constitutional and labor law. She joined the Domestic Policy Council this year at Reed's behest after she announced she was leaving her post as associate counsel to the President, which she held for more than a year. The President is said to be among her fans.

With so many respected, highly educated women working just outside the President's inner circle, many current and former White House officials predicted in interviews that it's only a matter of time before a woman with the right "fit" ascends to the inner circle. After all, Clinton as a governor had a female chief of staff, Betsey Wright. They acknowledge, however, that not one of the prospective candidates to succeed Bowles, who is expected to depart this year, is a woman. "It will depend more on the individual," Lewis said. "That one, I'd say, could happen. The nation is ready for that."

While there is no doubt that Clinton enjoys the company of guys--playing golf and hearts, swapping colorful stories, talking sports--no one interviewed suggested the President had ever displayed gender bias. None of the off-the-record examples of perceived gender bias among White House aides involved men who are now there. If there is any pervasive problem for women on the White House staff, it's the time it takes for them to polish the skills that men use to get into the political arena, to network into jobs and to latch onto supportive mentors. In most cases, female White House staff members who have moved up the ladder have had influential sponsors. Lewis has both Bill and Hillary Clinton in her corner; Mathews secured Rubin's backing when she was his assistant at the NEC; Yellen enjoyed an academic reputation and had ties to Administration officials, including Tyson and former student deputy Treasury secretary Lawrence H. Summers; Echaveste worked for Labor Secretary Robert B. Reich and brought the important Hispanic constituency with her to the West Wing; Kagan, after leaving Harvard Law School, clerked for White House counsel Abner J. Mikva, who later brought her into the White House; Mills has been encouraged in her rise by a succession of male counsels working for the President, including Lindsey.

"Presidents tend to turn to people already in government, particularly in a second term," according to Janet M. Martin, associate professor of government at Bowdoin College, who has written extensively about women in the executive branch. "Presidents turn to people who are familiar," she said in an interview. It is important, then, for women to build networks with men or women that can put them in positions of influence. "That's exactly what men do," Martin explained. Women in the Clinton White House said women are less likely than men to come from outside the Administration directly into a senior post.

The National Journal, August 2, 1997

"Many times, men may get to the table based on their reputation for wise counsel and good judgment," Mills said. "With women, I've noticed that it's more typical for us to arrive at the table after others have had a chance to work with us."

There is no surefire path to success for a woman in the White House, but those interviewed offered traits that help: high-quality work, good political judgment, loyalty to the President, a proven ability to deliver what's expected, a willingness to take on even "dog projects," self-confidence and people skills that can be used to build a consensus. And in the fast-paced atmosphere of the White House, women cannot expect hand-holding when things go wrong, or lavish praise when things go right, they said.

"The only acceptance that you don't get is your own," said a woman who left an influential White House post after working for Clinton. "You know, nobody tells you how to do the job; they just give it to you. It took me about three days to figure out what my mother always told me: 'People take their cue from you. If you think you're supposed to be there, you're supposed to be there.'" She added: "That's the way the boys operate. I think a lot of the reason girls don't get what they want is because they don't know how to deal in the same arenas, even though they've been successful in what they've done."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 05, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 119 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 The Austin American-Statesman
Austin American-Statesman

July 28, 1997

SECTION: News; Pg. A2

LENGTH: 451 words

HEADLINE: Clinton tells states to put welfare to work for poor

BYLINE: JODI ENDA

BODY:

WASHINGTON -- President Clinton will challenge the nation's governors today to plow what for many states is a windfall in federal welfare money back into programs for the poor.

States have profited handsomely from the booming economy, which has slashed their welfare rolls but not their share of federal welfare payments.

Austin American-Statesman, July 28, 1997

Because the case loads have dropped so dramatically, the states are basically getting more money per person on the rolls than they ever expected or than they ever had," said Elena Kagan, Clinton's deputy domestic policy assistant. The question is, how does the state use that money? Does it put it back into the system and help more people get jobs? Or do they say, Oh, look, this is a surplus. We'll build roads with it?"

Clinton doesn't want states to waste money intended to help welfare recipients, a concern heightened by the likelihood that the economy eventually will tighten and jobs will dry up.

Texas is not making the right choices," one administration official said, by way of illustration. Texas has reaped a \$363 million surplus based on declining welfare rolls, but it has used just \$126 million of that on services for welfare recipients, according to the Center for Public Policy Priorities, a private research institute in Austin. The rest of the money was used to fill gaps in other parts of the state budget, the center said.

In today's speech to the National Governors' Association meeting in Las Vegas, Clinton will urge states to spend new-found money on programs such as child care and transportation that enable welfare recipients to find and maintain jobs, Kagan said.

Although the administration and a number of welfare experts agree it is too soon to judge the ultimate success or failure of the year-old law, Clinton will tell governors that we have every reason to think that welfare reform is working," Kagan said.

It is difficult, however, to quantify.

You can measure the numbers on the welfare rolls -- that's decreasing," said Anna Kondratas of the Urban Institute, a nonprofit research organization that is monitoring the effects of welfare reform. On the other hand, if you're looking at outcomes and the effects on people, there's no way of telling right now."

Since Clinton took office in January 1993, about 3 million people have dropped off the welfare rolls, a decline of more than 20 percent, from more than 14 million people to fewer than 11 million, according to federal figures. More than a third of those left the welfare system in the past year, and those remaining represent the lowest percentage of the population on welfare since 1970.

LOAD-DATE: July 29, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 120 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Bulletin Broadfacing Network, Inc.
The Bulletin's Frontrunner

July 28, 1997, Monday

SECTION: WASHINGTON NEWS

The Bulletin's Frontrunner July 28, 1997, Monday

LENGTH: 147 words

HEADLINE: Clinton To Discuss Welfare Reform With Governors.

BODY:

Newspapers and Wires.

The Philadelphia Inquirer (7/28, A2, Enda) reported President Clinton will address the nation's governors today, with a "challenge...to plow what, for many states, is a windfall in Federal welfare money back into programs for the poor." At a convention of the National Governors Association, Clinton "will urge states to spend newfound money on programs such as child care and transportation, that enable welfare recipients to find and keep jobs," according to presidential adviser Elena Kagan. Clinton "also plans to push the governors to step up the collection of child-support payments," and "encourage states to subsidize employers that hire long-term welfare recipients."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 28, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 121 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Star-Telegram Newspaper, Inc.
THE FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

July 28, 1997, Monday FINAL AM EDITION

SECTION: NEWS; Pg. 1

LENGTH: 669 words

HEADLINE: President targets welfare windfalls;
Texas, other states urged to direct extra money to programs for poor

BYLINE: JODI ENDA, Knight-Ridder News Service

BODY:

WASHINGTON - President Clinton will challenge the nation's governors today to plow what for many states is a windfall in federal welfare money back into programs for the poor.

States like Texas have profited handsomely from the booming economy, which has slashed their welfare rolls but not their share of federal welfare payments. And Clinton, eager to declare his welfare program a success, wants to ensure that governors use the unexpected gains to help put poor people to work, not to fulfill personal wish lists.

THE FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM July 28, 1997, Monday

"Because the caseloads have dropped so dramatically, the states are basically getting more money per person on the rolls than they ever expected or than they ever had," said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy.

"The question is, How does the state use that money? Does it put it back into the system and help more people get jobs? Or do they say, 'Oh, look, this is a surplus. We'll build roads with it'?"

In a speech to the National Governors' Association meeting in Las Vegas, Clinton will urge states to spend newfound money on programs such as child care and transportation that enable welfare recipients to find and maintain jobs, Kagan said.

Clinton also plans to push the governors to step up the collection of child-support payments, a problem that many states have failed to address effectively even though stricter enforcement would make welfare unnecessary for many single parents.

Clinton is also expected to encourage states to subsidize employers that hire long-term welfare recipients, Kagan said.

Thirty-four states hand over workers' welfare checks to their employers, who use the money to pay part of their wages, according to the American Public Welfare Association, which represents state human service agencies.

What Clinton does not want is for states to fritter away money intended to help welfare recipients, a concern heightened by the likelihood that, eventually, the economy will tighten and job opportunities will dry up.

"Texas is not making the right choices," one administration official said by way of illustration. Texas has reaped a \$ 363 million surplus based on declining welfare rolls, but it has used just \$ 126 million of that on services for welfare recipients, according to the Center for Public Policy Priorities, a private research institute in Austin. The rest of the money was used to fill gaps in other parts of the budget, the center reported.

Although the administration and a number of welfare experts agree that it is too soon to judge the success or failure of the year-old law, Clinton will tell governors that "we have every reason to think that welfare reform is working," Kagan said.

"It's much too early to generalize, but we don't have any indications that states are not trying to do their very best," said Anna Kondratas of the Urban Institute, a nonprofit research organization that is monitoring the effects of welfare changes. "Most states are moving toward what the law requires, namely, getting as many people to work as possible," she said.

It is difficult, however, to quantify.

THE FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM July 28, 1997, Monday

"You can measure the numbers on the welfare rolls; that's decreasing," Kondratas said. "On the other hand, if you're looking at outcomes and the effects on people, there's no way of telling right now. "

Since Clinton took office in January 1993, about 3 million people have dropped off the welfare rolls for a decline of more than 20 percent, from more than 14 million people to fewer than 11 million, according to federal figures. More than one-third of those left the welfare system in the past year, and those remaining represent the lowest percentage of the population on welfare since 1970.

But no one knows why they left, how many found jobs, how many didn't like new work rules, how many got married or how many ran into state-imposed deadlines. The president's Council of Economic Advisers, in a May 9 report, attributed 44 percent of the drop to the strong economy, which created millions of jobs.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: August 28, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 122 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 DR Partners d/b/a Las Vegas Review-Journal
Las Vegas Review-Journal (Las Vegas, NV)

July 28, 1997 Monday, FINAL EDITION

SECTION: A; Pg. 3A

LENGTH: 495 words

HEADLINE: Clinton's LV speech to focus on welfare

BYLINE: Jane Ann Morrison

BODY:

By Jane Ann Morrison
Review-Journal

President Clinton's visit today to speak at the National Governors' Association meeting in Las Vegas may cause traffic tie-ups as his motorcade moves around town from the airport to various locations.

And it may be hard to avoid crossing paths with the presidential motorcade, because officials are not disclosing all of Clinton's Las Vegas stops.

Clinton's speech at The Mirage is set for 10:30 a.m., and afterward he is expected to attend a luncheon at a private Las Vegas home. The location is not being disclosed for security reasons.

The approximately 100 guests will be supporters or backers of U.S. Sen. Harry Reid, D-Nev., but the event itself is not a fund-raiser.

Las Vegas Review-Journal (Las Vegas, NV) July 28, 1997 Monday,

The White House is not disclosing what other stops he may make or even what time he is expected to depart Las Vegas for Washington aboard Air Force One.

Monday's visit marks Clinton's second visit to Nevada in three days. On Saturday he took part in a forum at Lake Tahoe, promising \$ 50 million in federal aid over the next two years to help preserve the lake.

Clinton's speech to the governors is expected to be a challenge to plow federal welfare money back into programs for the poor.

Last year, an election year, Clinton spoke to the governors meeting in Puerto Rico via satellite rather than in person when the subject also was welfare reform. He told the governors he would issue an executive order permitting the cutoff of welfare recipients after two years if Congress failed to pass a welfare reform bill.

The bill passed, so he didn't have to follow through on his pledge.

But on Monday, Clinton is expected to say that money from federal welfare reform needs to be reinvested in programs for the poor.

States have profited handsomely from the booming economy, which has slashed their welfare rolls but not their share of federal welfare payments. And Clinton, eager to brand welfare reform a success, wants to ensure that governors use the unexpected gains to help put poor people to work, not to fulfill personal wish lists.

"Because the caseloads have dropped so dramatically, the states are basically getting more money per person on the rolls than they ever expected or than they ever had," said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy.

"The question is, how does the state use that money? Does it put it back into the system and help more people get jobs? Or do they say, 'Oh, look, this is a surplus. We'll build roads with it?'"

Clinton will urge states to spend newfound money on programs such as child care and transportation that enable welfare recipients to find and maintain jobs, Kagan said.

Clinton plans to push the governors to step up the collection of child-support payments, a problem many states have failed to effectively address even though stricter enforcement would make welfare unnecessary for many single parents.

Knight-Ridder Newspapers contributed to this report.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 29, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 123 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 Agence France Presse
Agence France Presse

Agence France Presse, July 27, 1997

July 27, 1997 27:21 GMT

SECTION: Domestic, non-Washington, general news item

LENGTH: 374 words

HEADLINE: Welfare, children's aid to be debated at US governors' conference

DATELINE: LAS VEGAS, Nevada, July 27

BODY:

President Bill Clinton was expected to urge the 50 US governors Monday to take advantage of current economic conditions to spend more money for the poor, especially children.

Clinton, himself a former governor, may not get a warm reception at the 89th National Governors Association conference here Monday because 33 of the 50 states are headed now by the opposition Republican party.

Nevada Governor Bob Miller called Sunday for a "bipartisan spirit" in dealing with the states' "difficult problems."

Other speakers here include Microsoft Corporation chairman Bill Gates and former education secretary Lamar Alexander, a presidential candidate last year.

White House aides said Clinton will emphasize that states which profited from the booming economy should use the situation to improve conditions for the poor, who have been hit by federal welfare cuts.

"Because the case loads have dropped so dramatically, the states are basically getting more money per person on the rolls than they ever expected or than they ever had," said Elena Kagan, deputy assistant to the president for domestic policy.

"The question is, how does the state use that money? Does it put it back into the system and help more people get jobs? Or do they say, 'Oh, look, this is a surplus. We'll build roads with it?'"

Clinton was expected to urge states to spend this money on programs such as child care and transportation that enable welfare recipients to find and maintain jobs, Kagan said.

jls/r1/ok

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: July 27, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 124 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright M2 Communications Ltd 1997
M2 PRESSWIRE

June 30, 1997

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

LENGTH: 5680 words

HEADLINE: THE WHITE HOUSE

Briefing by Secretary Shalala and Bruce Reed

BODY:

MR. REED: Good afternoon, I'm Bruce Reed, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, and I'm going to talk just for a minute about this process. I think you have a piece of paper in front of you that basically describes everything I'm about to say.

Q We don't.

MR. REED: You don't? I want to make sure you get that piece of paper, so you don't actually have to listen to what we say. It's coming, I promise.

We'll go over some of the high points.

Okay, basically the President has asked Secretary Shalala and me to lead an interagency review of the proposed tobacco settlement. And this is going to be a thorough public health review that will involve a number of agencies and departments here within the White House. I think there are about 10 agencies involved and several White House offices. We have a great deal of expertise -

Q pardon me, sir, but is this the beginning of a new health act - national health act, or what?

MR. REED: No, this is -

Q Is this the beginning of a new national health program?

MR. REED: No, we're simply going to spend the next month reviewing the proposed tobacco settlement that was reached between the Attorneys General and the tobacco industry last week.

There will be about - a little over 50 senior people from around the government involved and the review is going to focus on four basic areas of the proposal. First, there will be a panel looking at regulatory issues. This is an area that the President just talked about at the bill-signing event. It will look principally at the FDA's authority to regulate nicotine as well as access, advertising, and labeling. It will also look at another element of the settlement, which is a proposal to limit environmental tobacco smoke in the workplace. And the regulatory team is convened by Elena Kagan, who is my deputy here at the White House. It involves people from HHS, Justice Department, FDA, and consists in large part of the lawyers and public health experts who put together the FDA rule in the first place which the President proposed in August of last year.

The second team will focus on the program and budget issues, the proposed uses of the settlement funds, including programs to reduce smoking and to provide children's health insurance. This team is made up of our top health policy experts. The meetings will be convened by Chris Jennings from here at the White House, who many of you know. It also includes Nancy-Ann Min from OMB, Bruce Vladeck from HHS, and several other top people from HHS.

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

A third group will be the legal team focusing on legal issues. This one also will be convened by Elena Kagan, and it will focus on the provisions on liability and damages and document disclosure, as well as other broader constitutional and legal questions about the proposal. And many members of this team are the same lawyers who helped build the legal case that secured the historic court victory in Greensboro on the FDA authority.

And then a fourth team will look at industry performance and accountability, primarily the economic impact of the proposal on industry performance and federal revenues and consumers and farmers and so on. This is the group that will look at the proposed incentives and penalties for reducing smoking that are part of this settlement. It will look at impacts on the price of tobacco, on consumption. And the Council of Economic Advisers will play a leading role in this group.

All of these groups have met in the past week. We're going to continue meeting over the next several weeks. And at the same time, we're going to have a comprehensive public outreach effort, particularly to public health experts and to the public health community. We will be working closely with a number of our allies in the effort to reduce smoking, including Doctors Koop and Kessler, and the major public health advocacy groups. And at the same time, we'll be spending a lot of time reaching out to members of Congress who obviously have a great interest in this proposal.

Q What's the goal of all of this?

MR. REED: Well, let me stop there and give Donna a chance to make a brief statement.

SECRETARY SHALALA: Let me just say a couple of things, and then I'll answer Helen's question. We wouldn't be here discussing this if the President hadn't already exerted bold leadership in this area of trying to reduce the number of children who start smoking in the first place and putting a regulatory framework in place over the issue of tobacco.

The review process we've just launched is rigorous and it's thorough. It requires interdisciplinary depth and very sophisticated analysis. We have not been handed a piece of legislation. We've been handed a proposal which has ideas, some of which are in great detail and others which are sort of the outlines.

What we need to do is to ask about that proposal, how it sits within existing law. Does it extend the regulatory framework and the power of the federal government? What role would the federal government play in relationship to cigarettes, for example? We need to ask, how is it balanced? How would it be implemented? Is it enforceable? How does it sit, again, within the existing framework of a set of laws that we now - and regulations that we now operate under? What is the impact on the economy? There has been a discussion about how much money it is; but who pays for this proposal? Is it the stockholders? Is it individuals because taxes will go up on cigarettes? Is it the broader taxpayers because some might be deductible under current laws?

And finally, does it meet our public health objectives? We have been very clear about our public health objectives. Cigarettes kill people. In particular, we know that if a youngster doesn't start smoking before they're 18, they're

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

less likely to begin smoking. Eighty percent of the people who smoke in this country started as teenagers. Our goal has been to reduce the number of teenagers. So the public health implications are very broad and central to what the President asked us to do.

Our goal is to find out whether this proposal will improve the public health and at what cost. And the cost implications are not just financial. They're implications for the way in which the government does its business and the way it organizes its business in relationship to an industry in this country.

Q Do you have any preliminary view?

SECRETARY SHALALA: No. And it's interesting. We don't because it's a complex proposal, and I think that even I, who normally has a view, an initial view from reading something, I do not. In some ways, the first people that have read this have read it for the five or six things that they have deep concerns about. We're reading it differently. We're going to take a comb and comb right through it.

For instance, the Treasury people will want to look at every pot of money and ask a series of questions. Our regulatory people want to look at the regulatory framework. We want to look at whether it's enforceable. We don't - this proposal doesn't have an enforcement mechanism in it. We have to think about, how would you enforce this on a private company.

That's why our approach, we believe, serves the public interest and makes certain that the President has the answer to every question anyone might possibly ask. It took us a year of very detailed work, once we decided to go ahead, to develop the FDA regulations that we currently have, and took a multi-disciplinary team. In my own department, every part of the development will be involved: from the National Institutes of Health, to the CDC, to the General Counsel's Office, to the substance abuse experts, to the FDA - the same team that sat together for over a year - more than 100 people we're involved - to develop those regulations. We sat last night for five hours with a huge interdisciplinary team, just going through line by line to figure out how we're going to structure our work with these various committees. It's hard work.

Q Is 30 days enough?

SECRETARY SHALALA: You know, we don't know. Every President I know wants everything done in 30 days - (laughter) -and we take our President seriously, with great passion. We will tell him where we are in 30 days. We'll try to meet any deadline that he sets for us, but this is hard work and not easy to do from a proposal, as opposed to a piece of legislation, that interrelates with other laws.

Q Do you feel that a lot of the areas that you describe as being only a sketch outline as opposed to detail were deliberately left in sketch outline -

SECRETARY SHALALA: No.

Q - because they hadn't reached agreement on those areas?

SECRETARY SHALALA: No, not necessarily. I haven't come to any conclusion about motivation. It just could have been who was at the table at the time and

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

what information they had, so I don't have any view on it.

Q One of the concerns that the President has expressed repeatedly now is this question of FDA's ability to regulate nicotine and cigarettes. Can you explain for us why that concern is there, what you have seen in the agreement thus far that causes you to have some concerns, and what the goal is, why it's so important that the FDA have that authority?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Well, I think that we go back to our original proposal, and that is, we exerted - we had a major public health problem in this country that we basically have been attacking with a variety of different campaigns and without much leverage on the industry, that we believed was increasingly creating a problem with young people, without ascribing a direct connection between that. We had larger and larger numbers of young people starting to smoke. Three thousand a day. A very scary proposition for the public health.

What authority did the federal government have to do something about that? It turned out it was the regulatory authority of the FDA as a way in which we began to move on a major public health problem. It wasn't the CDC; it happened to be the FDA. And therefore that has been the most powerful instrument that we have had to attack a public health issue.

In this proposal, to be fair to them, they seem to change the way in which the FDA does its business. Some people have said it's a negative, but when we looked at it there is a positive part to. It looks like they expand some authority. We need to look at the balance of that and whether it changes the power equation and the authority equation. And I think that's about as far as I would go without looking at the analysis my folks are doing.

Q And then how does the process work from there? Do you go back to the negotiators with your concerns, or do you go to the Hill? Or what -

SECRETARY SHALALA: Oh, I think that this has been sent to the President -

MR. REED: And to the world.

SECRETARY SHALALA: - and to the world and to the Congress. And everyone is going to look at it. The important thing is that these were in fact private negotiations that now are in the public. Some of them are requests to change federal law and to change the way we do business. That requires that the Congress pass laws, the President express an opinion, decide whether he's prepared to change some of those laws.

Q Are any of these groups going to take a look at the fees that the plaintiff lawyers would get -

SECRETARY SHALALA: Once you put this into the public arena, everybody is going to look at everything - on what's appropriate and who's paying them.

Q Because it wasn't mentioned as part of these working groups.

MR. REED: Well, there is nothing in the settlement about fees -

SECRETARY SHALALA: I think it was done as a separate arrangement. But that doesn't mean that the groups that are coming in to advise us aren't going to

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

make some comment on that. It's now in the public arena, and there will be lots of commentary.

Q Does your department take on this mission with relish, or with a heavy heart?

Q This proposal is barely making it through Congress. Yesterday's hearing was very contentious between -

SECRETARY SHALALA: Why don't you go ahead, and then I'll take the next one. Go ahead.

Q Are you enthusiastic about this or is this a heavy burden that you have to slog through?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Let me tell you what I told my colleagues the night before last as we sat down for the five-hour kind of line-by-line review. I said that when the President took the step on FDA regulations, I told them that this was a chance of a lifetime, that once in your career you get to take a step in an area of public health that is so dramatic and so significant in terms of its implications for the public health. And I said to them, I never thought we'd get another kick at the can. And if there was any possibility that we could take another giant step for the public health, we should not shirk from at least taking a look to see if there was a possibility. We go into this looking for another opportunity to take a strong step for public health, but with the same kind of hard-nosed rigor that we brought the first time around, when everybody said to us: Not a chance, the President is going into an election; there is not a chance that anyone is going to take this kind of step.

Q How do you get past the fact that there are all kinds of parliamentary tactics being invoked yesterday during the initial hearings to stall it, to kill it? How are you going to get any sense of cooperation out of the Congress when they themselves can't even - in this process when they among themselves can't even agree how to do it?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Well, I'd say, each to its own style in terms of a review. We're going to take a look at it analytically, tough-minded, without revealing our hand early on. The Congress is going to go through a public process, public reviews. We're going to obviously bring in people to give us their opinion. And at the end of the day, I would expect the Congress to do the same thing the President is going to do, and that is, give it the tough-minded review that the work that was done deserves.

Q Does the Supreme Court asbestos decision mean that you are looking more closely at having to do something in Congress, that you really need to get a proposal through Congress you can live with as opposed to going through litigation in the courts?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Oh, I think - no. We will not do anything in our review that will undermine what we believe is the very strong case that we have on the FDA regulations. So anything that we say or do as part of this review will not undermine our determination to go forward. We believe that what we have done is legal, that the FDA has the authority, that we have not undermined the First Amendment. We intend to go forward with that case.

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

Q Secretary Shalala, from all the voices we've heard, this is definitely a very contentious and controversial issue. I don't think King Solomon could probably solve it. But which way can you guarantee that the position the executive - the White House comes out won't be seen as a political decision, that you'll have enough backing that people will think your study is a valid one?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I think the President has a record that we're building on in children's health. He has made fundamental tough decisions - one of the toughest decisions any President has ever made to go forward on the issue of tobacco and children by putting the FDA regulations. We have credibility on this issue because we've stepped forward, we did it, we did it in the middle of an election year, when everybody said, can you believe that anyone would make this kind of decision. And the President believes deeply that the fundamental question we ought to ask is, will the public health be improved if we do something related to what the proposal is.

Q Is there anyone who is cautioning within the administration or voices from outside advising you, saying we ought not tinker with this too much because it was a carefully constructed deal and the tobacco companies might just walk away and that's not what we want? Or is the view more, hey, we're going to take a long hard look at this, and they can do whatever they want after the fact?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Every one. Everyone is saying everything. All of the above. I'm saying, let's be cautious and let's be rigorous. They're saying, well, if you tinker with it too much - but that's what people always say when they bring you a piece of legislation: We've got this very carefully constructed coalition. It's not new for us. People bring us proposals all the time - usually not as complex as this one - and we say, we're going to look at it through the clearest eyes that we possibly can because we have a responsibility to the public and we're going to do it in public.

Q Well, let me ask you, how seriously do you take their threat to, if you change it too much, we're going to take our stuff and go home?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I just - I think that we shouldn't comment on that, because what we want to do is to do what the President has said. We want to make a very rigorous - take a very rigorous look at this.

Q Well, are you tinkering or just judging it at this stage?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I think we're taking a very rigorous look at this proposal and you'll be the judge when the President decides what he wants to do.

Q Did the negotiators know you were going to do that?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Yes, the President announced it -

Q I mean, did they get any kind of word?

SECRETARY SHALALA: The President announced it before the negotiations were finished. The President announced that it would be put through a rigorous review by this administration.

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

Q But to come back to my question, do you see at the end of this process of 30 or whatever number of days it is that you will have just said, this works for us or this doesn't or this part - or will you be saying, this doesn't work for us but this would if you did something to it?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I don't know the answer to that question because we haven't finished our review. That's for a later point.

Q Is there any polling taking place to determine the public attitude on this settlement?

SECRETARY SHALALA: I don't know of any polling. Do you know of any polling? I'm sure that - my guess is, because the issue is out there, that there may be some public polling by the big polling agencies, but I'm not doing any polling. We know what the polls are and the public's attitude about children and tobacco.

Q One follow-up on that. What sort of role would there be for Mr. Moore and some of the tobacco - and others like tobacco representatives in this review process?

SECRETARY SHALALA: Well, you know, we may have some questions for them, I would think, about what did you mean by this. There is some language used in this that - for instance, in the first review, even some of my lawyers weren't quite sure what a "national protocol" meant. I mean, there was just some language

- I'm sure we'll be asking them questions. I'm sure they'll want to talk to us and tell us what they were trying to achieve. I'm sure they'll want to pitch us on how delicate it is. And the fact is that we're open, as we have always been on any proposal that comes to us.

Q How seriously are you taking Kessler and Koop's criticism of the FDA restrictions? Are they going to be advising your group?

SECRETARY SHALALA: The President has indicated that the Koop-Kessler committee will be listened to carefully. David Kessler has long been an associate. He and Chick Koop are the leading spokespeople on these issues and have been leaders in changing the role of the federal government. Their views will be taken very seriously.

Q They say it's unacceptable.

SECRETARY SHALALA: And we've already talked to - they've said that parts of this agreement are unacceptable, including the FDA piece. But you heard the President, he wants to make sure there is an FDA regulatory framework that's firm and as clear as what we currently believe we have.

Q Do you think it's within your mandate when you're doing this review - it must have already been discussed - that you can do the review and make recommendations about regulation, et cetera? And when you're making this study, are you going to be looking at regulation vis-a-vis enforceability? I mean, you've had experience with this with the drug war.

SECRETARY SHALALA: I think that we're pragmatic about this. We need to know whether this works, what does it cost, what's the balance - do we have to give

M2 PRESSWIRE June 30, 1997

anything up, what are we gaining. We're looking at it as we would any complex piece of legislation, in terms of its impact. How does it inter-relate? What are the new roles and responsibilities? What are the new regulatory frameworks? This proposal has a huge framework over retail business. It has implications for advertising, for the agriculture people, for everybody that sells a cigarette in the United States. It has a new framework for that.

That's why you can't just go through six things like this. You really have to look at it with great care.

Q How in this process do you address the overall question of whether it's tough enough on the tobacco industry? That's come up a lot in Congress.

SECRETARY SHALALA: Bruce and I will be working on this. I think that the first way I look at this is, does it substantially improve the public health. And then my second question is, at what cost and at what price.

But we're really single-minded in this administration. We want to substantially improve the public health. We want to reduce the number of kids that start smoking in the first place, substantially.

Q Will you be looking at -

SECRETARY SHALALA: And we're going to look at this as it adds to what we've already done. We've already set our goals. We've already put our regs in place. So that's the way -

Q But you don't have some level in mind which would be punishment enough for the tobacco industry -

SECRETARY SHALALA: No, because you have to -

Q - some good can come of it.

SECRETARY SHALALA: No, no. And I don't know enough to answer those questions yet. You're asking for more detail before we've really gotten into it. In fact, because I don't know much more than that, I think we've about run -

MR. REED: Thanks.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

SECRETARY SHALALA: Thank you very much. Thank you.

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: July 1, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 125 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 The Washington Post
The Washington Post

The Washington Post, June 28, 1997

June 28, 1997, Saturday, Final Edition

SECTION: A SECTION; Pg. A08

LENGTH: 627 words

HEADLINE: Clinton's Feelings Vary On Tobacco Settlement; Administration Review Could Be Delayed

BYLINE: John F. Harris, Washington Post Staff Writer

BODY:

President Clinton yesterday praised a proposed tobacco settlement one moment and expressed concerns the next as he announced details of an administration review designed to help him sort out his mixed emotions.

Clinton said he considers the recent agreement between tobacco foes and cigarette companies "a terrific achievement," even as he worries it may "paralyze the capacity" of the Food and Drug Administration to regulate nicotine and "protect the American people."

Last Sunday, Clinton pledged to complete his review within 30 days. But White House aides, noting Clinton's ambivalent feelings and the technical complexity of the issues, made clear that is a goal, and the decision could easily be delayed into early August. Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna E. Shalala even joked about the due date. "Every president I know wants everything done in 30 days, and we take our president seriously, with great passion," she said. "We will tell him where we are in 30 days. We'll try to meet any deadline that he sets for us, but this is hard work."

Shalala and White House Domestic Policy Adviser Bruce Reed, who are co-chairing the administration's review of the tobacco settlement, announced they are dividing the review into four parts.

A panel looking at regulatory issues will focus on how the proposed settlement, if it were to be approved as is by Congress and signed by Clinton, will affect the FDA's jurisdiction over nicotine in cigarettes. Clinton, at an unrelated bill signing, said this issue is "the critical thing" in his mind. This panel is being run by Reed's deputy, Elena Kagan.

A second panel will examine the proposed settlement's effect on the budget, including how a planned \$ 368 billion payment over 25 years would be spent. It is being run by White House health policy aide Christopher C. Jennings. A third panel, also led by Kagan, will examine how the settlement deals with legal liability for cigarette makers. The last panel will look at the economic impact of the settlement on the tobacco industry, including proposed incentives and penalties for reducing youth smoking that were included in the deal. This group will be led by the White House Council of Economic Advisers.

Reed said the review will include "a little over 50 senior people from around the government."

The Washington Post, June 28, 1997

Shalala framed one of the key issues for review when she asked, "Who pays for this proposal?"

"Is it the stockholders? Is it the individuals [smokers] because taxes will go up on cigarettes? Is it the broader taxpayers because some might be deductible under current laws?"

Shalala was getting at one of the less-noticed provisions of the proposal: that much of the \$ 368 billion would be paid through price hikes on tobacco products and that much of the payments would be tax deductible. Opponents of the deal have recommended that any penalties should be paid out of shareholder equity.

An administration official who asked not to be named said prospects for wrestling further concessions from the industry are good. "They have to have a settlement now. They've opened Pandora's box . . . They can't go back to stonewalling and denial," the official said.

Also yesterday, Clinton signed an anti-drug bill that passed Congress with nearly unanimous support. It makes matching grants of \$ 100,000 available for communities that have successful anti-drug programs. Clinton said the bill responds to a part of the drug problem not addressed by police arrests and border patrols. "Clearly it sends a signal that we are shifting emphasis to recognize that we will never get a hold of this problem unless we deal with the demand side here in America," he said.

Staff writer John Schwartz contributed to this report.

GRAPHIC: Photo, reuter/mark wilson, President Clinton says the tobacco proposal is an achievement, but he still has some concerns about it.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: June 29, 1997

LEVEL 1 - 126 OF 166 STORIES

Copyright 1997 U.S. Newswire, Inc.
U.S. Newswire

June 27, 1997 15:58 Eastern Time

SECTION: NATIONAL DESK

LENGTH: 2890 words

HEADLINE: Transcript of Press Briefing by Donna Shalala and Bruce Reed (1/2)

CONTACT: White House Press Office, 202-456-2100

U.S. Newswire, June 27, 1997

DATELINE: WASHINGTON, June 27

BODY:
Following is a transcript of a White House press briefing held today by Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna E. Shalala and Domestic Policy Adviser Bruce Reed (Part 1 of 2):

1:15 P.M. EDT

MR. REED: Good afternoon, I'm Bruce Reed, Assistant to the President for Domestic Policy, and I'm going to talk just for a minute about this process. I think you have a piece of paper in front of you that basically describes everything I'm about to say.

Q We don't.

MR. REED: You don't? I want to make sure you get that piece of paper, so you don't actually have to listen to what we say. It's coming, I promise.

We'll go over some of the high points.

Okay, basically the President has asked Secretary Shalala and me to lead an interagency review of the proposed tobacco settlement. And this is going to be a thorough public health review that will involve a number of agencies and departments here within the White House. I think there are about 10 agencies involved and several White House offices. We have a great deal of expertise --

Q Pardon me, sir, but is this the beginning of a new health act -- national health act, or what?

MR. REED: No, this is --

Q Is this the beginning of a new national health program?

MR. REED: No, we're simply going to spend the next month reviewing the proposed tobacco settlement that was reached between the Attorneys General and the tobacco industry last week.

There will be about -- a little over 50 senior people from around the government involved and the review is going to focus on four basic areas of the proposal. First, there will be a panel looking at regulatory issues. This is an area that the President just talked about at the bill-signing event. It will look principally at the FDA's authority to regulate nicotine as well as access, advertising, and labeling. It will also look at another element of the settlement, which is a proposal to limit environmental tobacco smoke in the workplace. And the regulatory team is convened by Elena Kagan, who is my deputy here at the White House. It involves people from HHS, Justice Department, FDA, and consists in large part of the lawyers and public health experts who put together the FDA rule in the first place which the President proposed in August of last year.

The second team will focus on the program and budget issues, the proposed uses of the settlement funds, including programs to reduce smoking and to provide children's health insurance. This team is made up of our top health policy experts. The meetings will be convened by Chris Jennings from here at the White House, who many of you know. It also includes Nancy-Ann Min from OMB, Bruce Vladeck from HHS, and several other top people from HHS.

A third group will be the legal team focusing on legal issues. This one also will be convened by Elena Kagan, and it will focus on the provisions on

U.S. Newswire, June 27, 1997

liability and damages and document disclosure, as well as other broader constitutional and legal questions about the proposal. And many members of this team are the same lawyers who helped build the legal case that secured the historic court victory in Greensboro on the FDA authority.

And then a fourth team will look at industry performance and accountability, primarily the economic impact of the proposal on industry performance and federal revenues and consumers and farmers and so on. This is the group that will look at the proposed incentives and penalties for reducing smoking that are part of this settlement. It will look at impacts on the price of tobacco, on consumption. And the Council of Economic Advisers will play a leading role in this group.

All of these groups have met in the past week. We're going to continue meeting over the next several weeks. And at the same time, we're going to have a comprehensive public outreach effort, particularly to public health experts and to the public health community. We will be working closely with a number of our allies in the effort to reduce smoking, including Doctors Koop and Kessler, and the major public health advocacy groups. And at the same time, we'll be spending a lot of time reaching out to members of Congress who obviously have a great interest in this proposal.

Q What's the goal of all of this?

MR. REED: Well, let me stop there and give Donna a chance to make a brief statement.

SECRETARY SHALALA: Let me just say a couple of things, and then I'll answer Helen's question. We wouldn't be here discussing this if the President hadn't already exerted bold leadership in this area of trying to reduce the number of children who start smoking in the first place and putting a regulatory framework in place over the issue of tobacco.

The review process we've just launched is rigorous and it's thorough. It requires interdisciplinary depth and very sophisticated analysis. We have not been handed a piece of legislation. We've been handed a proposal which has ideas, some of which are in great detail and others which are sort of the outlines.

What we need to do is to ask about that proposal, how it sits within existing law. Does it extend the regulatory framework and the power of the federal government? What role would the federal government play in relationship to cigarettes, for example? We need to ask, how is it balanced? How would it be implemented? Is it enforceable? How does it sit, again, within the existing framework of a set of laws that we now -- and regulations that we now operate under? What is the impact on the economy? There has been a discussion about how much money it is; but who pays for this proposal? Is it the stockholders? Is it individuals because taxes will go up on cigarettes? Is it the broader taxpayers because some might be deductible under current laws?

And finally, does it meet our public health objectives? We have been very clear about our public health objectives. Cigarettes kill people. In particular, we know that if a youngster doesn't start smoking before they're 18, they're less likely to begin smoking. Eighty percent of the people who smoke in this country started as teenagers. Our goal has been to reduce the number of teenagers. So the public health implications are very broad and central to